This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06818348 6

ZAZ

Towne

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

ANCIENT PAGAN MYSTERIES.

Wherein the OPINIONS of

Bp. WARBURTON and Dr. LELAND

on this ſubject, are particularly conſidered.

I have read this Book with much Pleasure, says Dr Parr. but with very little conviction.

John Towne.

LONDON:
Printed for L. DAVIS and C. REYMERS, oppoſite
Gray's Inn Gate, Holbourn.
MDCCLXVI.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
430955 A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1929 L

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

ANCIENT PAGAN MYSTERIES.

PART I.

AS the argument of the following ſheets relates to the Ancient Pagan MYSTERIES, it may be proper to begin with an explanation of the term. Each of the Pagan Gods had (beſides the *public* and *open)* a *ſecret worſhip* paid unto him; to which none were admitted but thoſe who had been ſelected by preparatory ceremonies, called INITIATION. This *ſecret worſhip* was termed the MYSTERIES.

Of theſe there were two ſorts, the *greater* and the *leſſer*. According to the Author of the *Divine Legation*, the leſſer taught, *by certain ſecret rites and ſhews*, the origin of SOCIETY, and the doctrine of a FUTURE STATE; they were preparatory to the *greater*, and might be ſafely communicated to *all the initiated without exception.*

The arcana of the GREATER MYSTERIES, were the doctrine of the unity, and the DETECTION of the *error of the vulgar polytheism.* These were not communicated to all the aspirants without exception, but only to a small and select number, who were judged capable of the secret.

The initiated were obliged by the most solemn engagements to commence a life of strictest piety and virtue. It was proper therefore to give them all the encouragement and assistance necessary for this purpose. Now in the Pagan world there was a powerful temptation to vice and debauchery, *the profligate examples of their Gods. Ego homuncio hoc non facerem?* [a] was the absolving formula, whenever any one was resolved to give a loose to his passions. This evil the Mysteries remedied by striking at the root of it: therefore, *such of the initiated as were judged capable*, were made acquainted with the whole delusion. "The *Mystagogue* taught them, "that Jupiter, Mercury, Bacchus, Venus, Mars, "and the whole rabble of licentious Deities, were "only dead mortals, subject, in life, to the same "passions and infirmities with themselves; but "having been, on other accounts, benefactors to "mankind, grateful posterity had deified them; "and, with their virtues, had indiscreetly canonized "their vices."

The fabulous Gods being thus routed, the *supreme cause* of all things naturally took their place. HIM they were taught to consider as the Creator of the universe, who pervaded all things by his virtue, and governed all by his providence. But here it must be observed, that the discovery of this *supreme cause* was so made, as to be consistent with the notion of local, tutelary Deities, beings superior to men, and inferior to GOD, and by him set over

[a] Terence, Eun. act. 3. sc. 5.

 the

the ſeveral parts of his creation. This was an opinion univerſally holden by antiquity, and never brought into queſtion by any Theiſt. What the arcana of the *Myſteries* overthrew, was the vulgar polytheiſm, the worſhip of dead men [b].

To prevent or rectify miſtakes, I ſhall add, that the Pagan Theology preſents us with two ſorts of Deities, who had their original here below, and were advanced from the condition of mortality into Gods: the one were denominated Dii majorum, the other Dii minorum, gentium. The firſt, or the *Celeſtials*, were not generally conceived to have been deceaſed mortals, but originally beings of the higheſt rank and order, or true and real Gods in their own right, and not in virtue of any deification, which had raiſed and exalted them to this ſtate; ſuch were Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune, Vulcan, and many others. As for the Dii minorum gentium; theſe were known to be only deceaſed mortals, deified for their public benefactions and ſervices: they were often called Heroes and Dæmons: they were held the proper objects of divine worſhip and adoration, but a worſhip and adoration far ſubordinate and inferior to that, which was paid to the ſovereign and ſupreme Gods, or the Dii majorum gentium.

The myſtagogue diſcovered the error of the vulgar polytheiſm, and *routed this rabble of the greater Gods*, by ſhewing that they were only dead men deified. By this means he diveſted them of their ſuperior characters, and put them on the ſame foot with the Dii minorum gentium, or the deities of the lower claſs and order. For it is not to be imagined, that the knowledge of their human exiſtence would have totally undeified them, and deprived them of all divine honours and adoration;

[b] Divine Legation, vol. i. p. 137. 153, 154, 155, 4th edit.

 but

but only that it muſt have degraded and reduced them to the lower degree of worſhip, which was paid to the inferior deities, or the heroes and dæmons [c].

This is all which the preſent ſyſtem or explication of the Myſteries requires us to ſuppoſe. The inſtitutors detected the human original of the greater Gods to a few, that their bad examples might not hurt private morals. They were generally eſteemed *Celeſtial Deities*; and, while regarded as ſuch, might be ſafely imitated in all things: the Myſteries brought them down to *Terreſtrial*, and then they were to be imitated with caution and reſerve.

However, it was natural for theſe politicians to keep this *a ſecret* in the Myſteries; for, in their opinion, not only the *extinction*, but even the *degradation*, of their falſe Gods, would have too much diſconcerted and embroiled the eſtabliſhed ſyſtem of vulgar polytheiſm.

This is a conciſe account of the Biſhop's repreſentation of the Pagan religious Myſteries, which the ingenious Dr. Leland has thought fit to controvert, by proof of theſe two propoſitions: 1. That the Myſteries did not detect the error of the vulgar polytheiſm: 2. That they did not teach the unity [d].

In proof of his firſt propoſition, he in one place expatiates on the abſurdity of ſuppoſing, "That "the legiſlators, in the inſtitution of the Myſteries,

[c] The church of Rome know that their ſaints are mortals departed. This is deemed no objection to their worſhip. Were they perſuaded that Jeſus was a mere mortal, this would be deemed an objection to his. Why this difference? Becauſe he is honoured and diſtinguiſhed with ſuperior worſhip, they with inferior. But what then! this perſuaſion would not deprive him of all worſhip, but only reduce him to the claſs of ſaints.

[d] *Advantage and neceſſity of the Chriſtian Revelation*, vol. 1. c. 7, 8.

"would

"would attempt to draw THE PEOPLE off from "that polytheism, which they themselves had en- "couraged and established for the welfare of the "state."

In another he says, "Nor do I believe any one "passage can be produced from all Pagan antiquity "to shew, that the design of the Mysteries was to "undeceive THE PEOPLE as to the vulgar poly- "theism, and *to draw them off from the worship* "*of the deities commonly adored.*"

Again, "It does not appear from fact and ex- "perience, that the Mysteries turned any of THE "PEOPLE from their polytheism and idolatry. "He (the Bishop) talks indeed of the legisla- "tor's having *successfully employed the Mysteries for* "*regulating the vulgar polytheism.* But how is this "proved? Can any instances be produced of per- "sons that were converted from the public idola- "try and polytheism by the Mysteries? [e]"

Here he charges the Author of the Divine Legation, first, With holding that the detection of the vulgar error of polytheism extended to *the whole body of the initiated* without distinction, and that they were at full liberty to publish and divulge it. 2dly, With holding that this detection was made in order to draw off THE PEOPLE from the public and established religion. But his Lordship declares in direct and express terms, that it was restrained to *the few*, who were admitted to the *greater* Mysteries; and to these it was entrusted under the most solemn and tremendous seal of secrecy. He is so far from holding it was made *in order to draw off the people from the public worship*, that he maintains it was purposely and industriously concealed from them; and, what is more, he holds that it was purposely and industriously concealed

[e] P. 236. 215, 216. 242.

from

from them, lest it should have disturbed and disordered the public worship, by disposing them to think more lightly of the *greater* Gods, than was consistent with the divine honours and adoration paid to them.

As the misconception or misrepresentation of the learned Writer is so very strong and glaring, it might be sufficient to mark the passages in the Divine Legation, where this, and a great deal more to the same effect, may be seen by those who will give themselves the trouble to turn to them [f]. But as this is a point of great importance to the present argument, I must beg leave to add the following observations.

1. In order to give us a true and just idea of the Bishop's system, the Doctor presents his reader with some of the passages, in which his Lordship declares, that only the few, who were admitted to the *greater* Mysteries, were made acquainted with the error of the vulgar polytheism [g].

2. He more than once remarks, that the Bishop appropriates the doctrine of the unity to the

[f] Pages 154, 155. 157. 160. 164. 167. 170. 180. 183. Divine Legation, vol. i. part i. printed 1755.

[g] Page 157, the Bishop has these words, "That this "account of the SECRET, in the *greater* Mysteries, is "no precarious hypothesis, I shall shew from the clear "evidence of antiquity, which expressly informs us of "these two particulars: *that the errors of polytheism were* "*detected*, and the doctrine of the unity taught in the mys-"teries. But when the ancients speak of *Mysteries* inde-"finitely, they generally mean the *greater*."

The learned Doctor quotes part of this passage, p. 203. It is scarce credible he could quote it without seeing the detection of the error of polytheism was confined to the *greater* Mysteries.—In the same place he cites two passages from the *Divine Legation*, which say this detection was only imparted to *such of the initiated*, as were judged capable of the secret.

greater

greater Mysteries [h]. 'Tis the more extraordinary, therefore, he should not have seen that the detection of the error of polytheism was not extended beyond the same bounds. For it sometimes happens, that the very passages which thus limit and circumscribe the one, do in the same manner limit and circumscribe the other [i].

3. He sometimes represents the learned Prelate as confining this detection to the small and select number of aspirants, who were initiated in the *greater* Mysteries [k]. Had he *always* argued on this idea, he would have deprived himself of the many arguments which compose one third of his two chapters on this subject. But then he would also have deprived the Writers against him of the opportunity of shewing, that he knew the system of the Divine Legation to be the very reverse of what his argument generally implies it to be.

The

[h] P. 196, 197. 427, 428.

[i] "Thus, it appears, that the *arcana* in the GREATER "Mysteries, were the *detection of the error of vulgar polytheism*, and the discovery of the doctrine of the unity." Divine Legation, p. 167.

"The two important doctrines, taught *in secret*, were "*the detection of polytheism*, and the discovery of the unity." p. 170.

The learned Gentleman has himself quoted p. 157. in which the Bishop, speaking of the SECRET, in the *greater* Mysteries, says, "The clear evidence of antiquity informs us, that *the errors of polytheism were detected*, "and the doctrine of the unity taught and explained in "the Mysteries. But when the ancients speak of *Mysteries* indefinitely, they generally mean the *greater*."

[k] "It may seem a little surprizing, that Plutarch should "here represent that as an impious and atheistical doctrine, which, *according to our learned Author, the mystagogues taught the initiated in the* GREATER *Mysteries*, "and which Cicero and others made no scruple of declaring." p. 217.

"Whereas

The Doctor, in his late work, has been very laudably employed in pointing out the *necessity* and *advantage* of the Christian revelation. He thought the evidence for these was diminished and weakened by what the Bishop had said of the detection of the vulgar error of polytheism in the Mysteries. This seems to have occasioned his two chapters on this subject [l]. Now he owns that this evidence is not affected by that part of his Lordship's system, which asserts the doctrine of the unity to the Mysteries; and this, because the discovery was made only to a few under the seal of secrecy. As then he *sometimes did* see, and *always might* have seen, that the error of the vulgar polytheism was revealed with the same circumspection, he ought to absolve this part also of his Lordship's system from having any perverse and malignant influence on the evidence of revealed religion [m].

Having shewn, *but against no adversary*, that the Mysteries could not expose the illusion of the common polytheism *promiscuously to all*, he advances another argument to prove, that they could not

" Whereas if the design of the *secret* doctrine of the GREATER Mysteries, had been *to detect the error of the* " *vulgar polytheism*, and to teach the initiated, that the " popular Deities were really no Gods, the charge might " have been retorted on themselves." p. 247.

[l] Vide beginning of c. 8.

[m] The Bishop says, " What the arcana of the Mysteries " overthrew, was the vulgar polytheism, the worship of " dead men." p. 155.

The Doctor supposes him to mean, they *overthrew the* PRACTICE of the vulgar polytheism, or aimed to extirpate and put an end to this particular mode of worship. But it appears from the context, and every page of the Dissertation, he could intend to affirm no more, than that they overthrew and subverted the ERROR of this worship, by shewing to a few of the initiated, that the objects of it were not true and real Gods, but only dead men deified.

teach

teach it to a few under the most solemn engagement to secrecy. "It was not, says he, the virtue "of *a few individuals*, but the society in general "that the magistrate must be supposed to have in "view. And how could this end be answered by "committing the secret, which is supposed to be "of such importance to the morals of the people, "only to *a few of the initiated*, who were at the "same time brought under the most solemn en-"gagements not to discover it?——And even as "to those few to whom the secret was communi-"cated, to what purpose would it be to instruct "the initiated in doctrines they were not to make "use of?——And what opinion could they have "of the honesty of those, who discovered to them "the delusion of the vulgar polytheism, and the "falshood of the religion of their country, and yet "urge it as a duty upon them to conform to it [n]?"

I answer, the secret was communicated to those, who were judged capable of bearing it, because it would be of use and service in guarding them against, or, rather, in exempting them from, the strong and powerful temptation above-mentioned.

It was not communicated promiscuously to all, because, in the opinion of the ancients, the error of polytheism was so inveterate, that it could not be expelled, without endangering the peace and quiet of the state.

The magistrate's end was answered by committing the secret to *as many*, as could be entrusted with it, consistently with the public tranquillity. This was being as fully and extensively useful, as the principles, or, rather prejudices of those times, would permit him to be.

If the few, instructed in the secret, *did not make a good use of it*, it must have been their own fault.

[n] P. 238.

For the knowing their vices and debaucheries were not warranted and authorized by the examples of the gods, must have had a natural tendency to improve their morals [o].

But he asks, "What opinion could they have of "the *honesty* of those who discovered to them the "delusion and falshood of the religion of their "country, and yet urge it upon them as a duty to "conform to it?"

The question might have been asked by a writer, thinking only of his own times, as having indeed nothing else to think on. But it was not expected from the learned Doctor, who is so lately come from the cabinet of the old lawgivers, laden with the treasures of their political and civil wisdom. *Varro* and *Cicero* deemed this no impeachment of their honesty, but the most commendable instance of their prudence. They taught, and were instructed to look upon *utility*, and not *truth*, as the end of the national religion: their maxims with regard to the publick worship were—quæ omnia sapiens servabit tanquam *legibus jussa*, non tanquam *diis gratia*.

Omnem istam ignobilem deorum turbam, quam longa superstitio congessit, sic adorabimus, ut mominerimus cultum istum *ad morem* magis quam *ad rem* pertinere [p].

He

[o] In one of the passages quoted, p. 6. the Doctor seems much displeased with his Lordship for asserting, "That "the magistrate had *successfully* employed the Mysteries "for regulating the vulgar polytheism." And yet a *regulation*, which left men no longer exposed to the temptation arising from the criminal examples of the greater gods, might surely be styled *successful*, as it could not but contribute to promote the practice of virtue.

[p] Varro apud August. de Civ. Dei, 6. 10. To this the ingenious Writer himself accedes. "It was, says he, a "maxim among many of the ancients, that it was lawful "to deceive the people for the public good. They were "for

He might have ſeen then, that *detecting the error of polytheiſm* was *one* thing, and *ſubverting the practice of it*, *another*; and that, in the opinion of the ancients, to *believe* and to *practiſe*, were parts of two different ſyſtems. What is moſt extraordinary, it appears from the quotation in the laſt note, that he *ſometimes* did ſee it.

What then is this learned Author doing, while he addreſſes himſelf to ſhew, that the ancient legiſlators could not reveal the error of polytheiſm to *a few* in the Myſteries? Why, he is addreſſing himſelf to ſhew, that they could not act conformably to the principles of ancient policy and wiſdom, or thoſe very principles, which he himſelf owns were adopted and practiſed by them. However, his reaſoning may ſtill ſatisfy and content thoſe, to whom antiquity is known only by ANALOGY, that is, by the religious opinions, the civil cuſtoms, and the philoſophical ideas of their own times.

It is certain, that, with all their boaſted knowledge in the ſcience of legiſlation, the ancients were ſometimes moſt egregiouſly miſled by their falſe and erroneous politics. This is obvious from their fancying the error of polytheiſm, and the notion of the true God, would have been injurious to ſociety, if they were preached up to the people at large. But who does this concern? Not the Biſhop. He gives an hiſtorical account of their conduct; he tells a fact, namely, that they revealed the error of polytheiſm to a few of the initiated; he ſupports this fact on the evidence of antiquity; he explains the motive to it, which he repreſents as commendable. Thus he is anſwerable, not for their

" for the moſt part, *not very ſtrict in their notions with re-*
" *ſpect to the obligations of truth, and thought there was no*
" *harm in making uſe of falſhood when it was profitable.*" p. 388.

wisdom and *policy*, but for their *good intentions* only. These he thinks sufficiently manifested by their endeavour to do all the good, which their principles, in that wretched and benighted situation, would enable the best and wisest of the Pagans to do.

The point in dispute is, Whether the Mysteries detected the error of the vulgar polytheism, or the error of the worship which was peculiar and appropriated to the human gods of the higher order, such as Jupiter, Neptune, Vulcan, &c.? The Bishop holds that they did this, by shewing that they were dead men, and not naturally and originally beings of a superior species to the dæmons and heroes, or the Dii minorum gentium. The Doctor owns they discovered the human birth and extraction of these gods, but thinks this nothing to the purpose: for that the having been once men, was very consistent, in the notions which then obtained, with their divinity. And here he speaks fully and directly to the point in hand, by declaring, that the greatest of these deities was known by the Pagans to be only a dead man, or one of their deceased worthies, and yet was deemed the proper and adequate object of all the divine honours and adoration, which were given to the divinities of the first rank. "The Cretans, says he, "who celebrated the Mysteries openly, and published their sacred doctrines, i. e. *those which in* "*other places were kept secret and hidden*, without "reserve, boasted of having Jupiter's tomb amongst them; but this did not hinder them from "regarding and worshipping him, as the chief of "the deities, the Father of gods and men [q]."

"The Cretans boasted they had Jupiter's tomb "amongst them."——What then! does it follow that all the world believed there could be no bad

[q] P. 215, 216.

con-

consequences to the national idolatries from a proclamation of this truth? This, indeed, the learned person would insinuate: but the contrary is just the truth. The world, by its treatment of the Cretans, declared that it would have the most pernicious consequences. Enraged at these bablers, it stigmatized them with the most infamous of all brands, ETERNAL LIARS [r].

He owns, "That the Cretans published without "reserve those sacred doctrines, which *in all other* "*places* were kept secret and hidden." As then their practice was contrary to the practice of all the world besides, Why is it brought as a proof that all the world besides thought as they did? For the present inquiry is concerning the *general* opinion or sentiment of the ancient Pagans.

The Doctor would smile at any one who should urge the *singular* and *extraordinary* practice of the Cretans, to prove it was the *general* custom of the ancients to solemnize the Mysteries *in public and open day.*

It is one of the most generally received opinions, that the miracles of Jesus are a good proof of the divinity of his mission; and yet there may not be wanting hereafter some critic to tell the world it was all a mistake, for M. Rousseau of Geneva said, they were no proof at all.

We must now wait on the learned Gentleman from Greece to Egypt. He goes on thus: "The "Egyptian priests, as Plutarch informs us, pre-"tended to shew the sepulchre of Osiris, yet this "was not thought to be an objection against their "worshipping him as a god [s]."

As he undertakes to shew, that the Egyptian priests were always ready to shew the sepulchre, and

[r] Divine Legation, p. 183. [s] P. 215, 216.

point

point out the human original of Osiris, he must permit me to offer to his consideration the following facts and authorities in support of the contrary opinion.

Varro supposes that the image of Harpocrates, placed before the Egyptian temples, pressing his lips with one of his fingers, was designed to signify that the human state and condition of the gods was not to be discovered to the people [t].

Diodorus Siculus informs us, that the Egyptian priests were the last men to do what the Doctor supposes they were constantly doing: for that shewing the tomb of Osiris was regarded by them as *the highest impiety, or revealing the secrets of the gods* [u].

Even the infliction of capital punishments was threatned to all, who should give out that the gods had been men [w].

The celebrated fragment of Sanchoniathon, translated by Philo Byblius, and preserved by Eusebius, contains the history of some of the first men, who were consecrated and erected into gods. We are told, "He transcribed this history from *the secret* "*Records*, kept in the *Penetralia* of the temples, "written in *a sacred sacerdotal character*, called the

[t] Erat etiam simulacrum, quod digito labiis impresso admonere videretur ut silentium fieret. Hoc significare idem Varro existimat, ut *homines eos* (Isim et Serapim) *fuisse taceretur*. Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 18. 5.

[u] He says, "There were different opinions concerning "the places where Isis and Osiris were buried, *because the* "*priests*, who knew the truth, *were unwilling to divulge* "*it, for fear of incurring the punishments denounced against* "*those who should reveal the secrets of the gods*." Biblioth. l. 1.

[w] Constitutum est etiam de illo (Serapide) ut quisquis cum *hominem* dixisset fuisse, *capitalem penderet pœnam*. Aug. de C. D. 18. 5.

"*Am-*

"*Ammonean* [x]." Thus the histories, recording and specifying the human birth and actions of the gods, were lodged in the *Adyta* of the temples, which were only accessible to a few of the more learned priests: and they were rendered more inaccessible still, by being written in the *sacred* and *sacerdotal character*, which but a small and select number of this order was able to decypher and explain.

One Leo, chief hierophant in the Egyptian Mysteries, informed Alexander of Macedon, "That "not only such as *Picus*, and *Faunus*, and *Æneas*, "and *Romulus*, nay *Hercules*, and *Æsculapius*, and "*Bacchus*, the son of *Semele*, and *Castor* and *Pol-* "*lux*, and all others of the same rank, had been "advanced from the condition of humanity into "gods; but that even these deities of the higher "order, the Dii majorum gentium, those who *Ci-* "*cero*, without naming, seems to carp at in his "*Tusculans*, such as *Jupiter*, *Juno*, *Saturn*, *Nep-* "*tune*, *Vulcan*, *Vesta*, and many others, (whom "Varro endeavours to allegorize into the elements "or parts of the world) were in truth, only mor- "tal men. But the priest, being under great fears "and apprehensions while he was telling this, *as* "*conscious that he was betraying the secret of the* "*Mysteries*, begged of Alexander, when he found "that he intended to communicate it to his mo- "ther, that he would enjoin her to burn the letter "as soon as she had read it [y]."

They

[x] "Sanchoniathon transcribed his history from the "*secret archives*, kept in the Penetralia of the temples, "written in *a sacred sacerdotal character*, called the *Ammo-* "*nean*." Philo Byblius in Eusebii Præp. Evang. l. 1. c. 9. p. 32. Ed. Vig.

[y] August. de Civ. D. 8. 5. Divine Legat. p. 157, 158. The words used by Austin are, Timens quasi *revelata mysteria*.

They could not have more effectually shewn their desire of concealing this doctrine, than by making it *the secret* of the Mysteries, which it was not only penal to divulge, but even to hear divulged by others [z].

Again: In the history of the gods, and their public worship, there were many circumstances plainly decisive of their humanity. All these, the protectors of the national religion contrived to distinguish and explain away by allegorical interpretations, pretending they were significative of physical, moral, and divine truths. In Plutarch's tract of Isis and Osiris, we meet with many curious devices and expedients of this sort. Thus the *burial* of Osiris was said to be only a representation of the seed lately *sown* and *covered* in the earth. His reviving and appearing again, signified *its springing and ris-*

teria. This implies that the humanity of the greater Gods was *the secret* of the Mysteries. Cyprian speaks out more plainly, Proditum sibi *de diis hominibus* a sacerdote *secretum.* De Idol. Ven. So does Minucius Felix, c. 21. Alexander ille magnus Macedo *insigni volumine* ad matrem suam scripsit, metu suæ potestatis proditum sibi *de diis hominibus* a sacerdote *secretum.*

[z] Even the gods themselves were not authorized to divulge it.

Non ego tentavi, nulli temeranda deorum,
Audax laudandæ sacra docere Deæ.
Tibullus, l. 3. Eleg. 5. 7, 8.

If we believe with the learned Doctor, that the Egyptians were not cautious of revealing the human nature and condition of their gods, we must believe with another writer, that all which the Fathers have said of this letter of Alexander to his mother, is a fiction and invention of their own. At least, we shall furnish him with a better argument to disprove its genuineness and authenticity, than any he has alledged for this purpose. V. Pauli Ernesti Jablonski Pantheon Ægyptiorum. prolegomena, c. 16. p. 31.

ing

ing above ground [a]. Plutarch assures us, that these explications were greedily received and swallowed *by the people* [b]; in other words, they did not understand his *death* and *burial* in a *literal sense*, or look upon him as a deceased mortal.

If then he says the Egyptian priests shewed the sepulchre of Osiris, he says also in the very same treatise, that they invented allegories in order to save the honour of this dignified mortal, to cover and disguise the circumstances of his *death* and *burial*, and to keep his humanity out of sight.

In the very page where he tells us the Egyptian priests shewed the sepulchre of Osiris, he declares, that the people were almost *every where* bred up in the persuasion and belief, that the national gods were not dead men [c].

When the learned Gentleman shall attempt to reconcile these facts and authorities to his system of Osiris, and the Egyptian gods, it may be proper to resume this part of the argument. In the mean time I shall proceed to observe, that *Euhemerus* published his *Historia Sacra*, in which he taught that all

[a] λεγοντες θαπτεσθαι τον μεν Οσιριν, οτε κρυπτεται τη γη σπειρομενος ο καρπος, αυτις δε αναβιωσθαι κ᾽ αναφαινεσθαι, οτε θλαστησεως αρχη.

[b] Plutarch, ibidem.

[c] P. 359, Xyland. Ed. Doctor L. refers to this passage in the following words: "Plutarch speaking of those who "represented some of the gods to have been originally fa- "mous men, who had obtained the honour of divinity, says, "that this is to attempt to move things which ought not to "be stirred, and to bring down those great and venerable "names from Heaven to earth, and thereby *to overturn and* "*dissolve that religious persuasion, which hath taken possession* "*of the minds of almost all men from their birth*, i. e. to "open a wide door to the atheistical croud, who are for "turning divine things into human, and to give a splendid "licence to the illusions of Euhemerus the Messinian, "whom he there charges as having scattered all manner "of atheism through the world." p. 217, 218.

the gods were dead men: and for thus mortalizing these fictitious and imaginary divinities, he was branded as a derider and subverter of the public worship [d]. Now, on the Doctor's hypothesis, the vulgar Pagans were taught to look upon their gods as deceased men, and consequently this mortalizing system of Euhemerus must have been the popular and established system of the Pagan world. He must then have been most cruelly calumniated and defamed, as he only taught a doctrine which the public ministers of religion were daily teaching, and which was not thought opprobrious or injurious to the national worship of those times.

Cicero, Plutarch, and other ancients, speak of this system of Euhemerus, as being destructive of, and incompatible with, all religious persuasion and belief. But, according to the Doctor's hypothesis, they could not but know, that the Pagan religion had all along consisted with the persuasion and belief, that their greater gods were deceased mortals. What then must we think of men, who could solemnly assert a fact, which was contradicted, and which they knew to be contradicted, by the history and experience of all ages? or, rather, What must we think of an hypothesis which commands us to believe, that the most learned and inquisitive Pagans knew nothing of the religion of ancient Paganism?

[d] In the last note, Plutarch charges him with scattering all manner of atheism through the world, and dissolving the religious belief which men had of the nature and attributes of their gods.

Cicero, speaking of Euhemerus and his followers, says, *nonne expertis sunt religionum omnium?*

Ab Euhemero et mortes et sepulturæ demonstrantur deorum. Utrum igitur hic *confirmasse religionem videtur, an penitus totam sustulisse?* De Nat. Deor. 1. 42.

But now he roundly affirmed, that the Pagans would not quarrel with their gods for a trifle. They could allow their humanity without impeaching their divinity. But finding some material witnesses against this affirmation, he soon qualifies his general assertion, and confesses the pagans were divided in their opinions on this head. "Some of "them, says he, were indeed sensible, that if it "was once allowed, that their gods had been of "human extraction, this might be turned to the "disadvantage of the public religion." Among these he ranks Scævola and Plutarch, and then adds, "But whatever Plutarch, and some others "might think, those that instituted and conducted "the Mysteries, seem to have been of *another* "*mind* [e]."

Another mind! *In what?* and, *From whom?* why, *the institutors of the Mysteries* were of a different opinion from Plutarch, who believed, that the knowledge of the human extraction of the national gods was unfavourable to their worship. Those *institutors of the Mysteries*, who made their rites secret and mysterious for this very purpose, to keep the knowledge of the *human extraction* of the gods from *the body of the people.*

If they were of opinion, that the propagation of this doctrine was innoxious and harmless, Why did they make it one of the arcana, which were communicated only to *a few* of the participants [f]? Or, Why was the Egyptian Hierophant seized with so much terror and consternation on the apprehension that Alexander was going to divulge this doctrine? And, lastly, Why were not the Mysteries celebrated in as *public* and *open* a manner in all other places as

[e] p. 217.

[f] Vide p. 15, 16, the passages quoted from Austin, Cyprian, Minucius Felix.

in *Crete?* If the propagation of this doctrine had been held perfectly innoxious and harmless, all the initiated, and even uninitiated, might have been safely entrusted with it.

He says those, who presided over the Mysteries, were *of a different opinion* from Plutarch, who had Euhemerus in execration for publishing to the people a particular, minute, and detailed history of the lives and actions of the Gods. And yet those, who presided over the Mysteries, were so exasperated at him, for bringing these anecdotes to light, that, on this account, they took care to have him branded by the public as the pest of society, and the avowed enemy of all religion [f].

But the celebrated Writer proceeds. "For if "they taught the initiated, that the Gods com- "monly received had been once men, it is reason- "able to suppose, that they took care that the pub- "lic religion should not suffer by it, by letting "them know, that notwithstanding this *they ought* "*to be regarded as Gods*, and to have that divine ho- "nour and worship rendered to them, which anci- "ent tradition and the laws required [g]."

He then produces two passages from the Divine Legation [h], which imply that the Mysteries did not aim at the subversion or extirpation of the public worship. Hence he infers the Bishop must acknowledge, the institutors of the Mysteries were of opinion, the discovery of the human existence of the Gods would not hurt or interfere with the established religion.

His argument stands thus: "The Mystagogue "would not have detected the human origin of the "Gods, unless he had been assured the public "religion would not suffer by it. But he could "not be assured that the public religion would not

[f] Vide the Divine Legation. [g] p. 217. [h] p. 218, 219.

"suffer

"suffer by it, unless he was persuaded the initiated "would think this human origin of the Gods per-"fectly consistent with the divinity ascribed to "them."

The first proposition is true; the second is not. He revealed the error of polytheism to *very few* of the initiated. These few entered into the most solemn obligations not to disclose it. At the same time they were outwardly to conform to, and comply with, the national mode of worship.

Now, what danger to this worship, while the error of it was discovered to a small number under the precautions just mentioned? But the misfortune is, the learned Gentleman will not see, that the Mysteries might subvert and overthrow the *error* of this worship, with respect to *the few*, and yet preserve and maintain the *practice* of it, both with respect to *the few*, and the *many* [1].

It

[1] According to the Doctor, the Mystagogue not only taught the initiated to comply outwardly with the public mode of worship, but even required them to *believe*, that the Deities of the higher rank and order, whom he declared to be dead men, *still ought to be regarded as* GODS, *and to have that divine honour and worship rendered to them, which ancient tradition and the laws required.*

The divine honour and worship which ancient tradition and the laws prescribed for Jupiter, was the divine honour and worship supposed to be due to a God, or superior Being, immortal, incorruptible, without beginning or end.

Ζευς ην, Ζευς εστι, Ζευς εσσεται——
Συ δ' ω θανες, εσσι γαρ αιει.

Would then the Mystagogue inform the initiated that Jupiter was only a deceased man, and at the same time let them know, or command them to believe, that notwithstanding this he ought to be worshipped and regarded as a real God, eternal, unmade, and incorruptible? If he could tell them this, he might tell them any thing. Having such *babes* and *sucklings* to deal with, he might, like other publick

It may be ſaid, the inſtitutors of the Myſteries had ſo high a reverence for the eſtabliſhed religion, that they would not teach any doctrines inconſiſtent with it, even to the ſmalleſt number of the initiated, and under the ſtrongeſt obligations to ſecrecy.

I ſhall confront the objection with a plain matter of fact. Diagoras revealed the ſecret of the Myſteries, and for this he was proſecuted as a contemner and derider of the national religions [k]. The ſecret therefore of the Myſteries muſt have detected and expoſed the vanity and deluſion of this ſyſtem.

Let then this ingenious Writer point out the *particular doctrine* or *principle*, by which the Myſteries expoſed the nakedneſs of the public worſhip, if he perſiſts in affirming, that they did not do this by detecting the humanity of the greater Gods. And here, if I miſtake not, he will find himſelf embarraſſed to ſome purpoſe. I know but of two doctrines ſuppoſed to be taught in the Myſteries,

publick teachers in the ſame ſituation, be tempted to try how far their credulity would go.

But he was concerned with a few of the moſt diſtinguiſhed characters of paganiſm, or perſons eminent for their rank, virtue, and wiſdom: And were *theſe* likely to believe that a deceaſed mortal was eternal, ungenerated, and not ſubject to corruption?

[k] Myſteria adeo contemnebat, ut multos a virtute averteret. Hoc igitur impium ipſius ſtudium Athenienſes per præconis vocem promulgarunt adverſus ipſum, et in ærea columna ſcripſerunt, ut ille quidem, qui ipſum inter feciſſet, talentum acciperet. Hoc promulgatum fuit propter ipſius impietatem, quia Myſteria narrabat omnibus, ea evulgans et extenuans, et illos, qui volebant initiari, avertens ——Suidas in Voce Diagoras.

Diagoræ quidem ſacrilegam impietatem jure damnabant Athenienſes, qui cum arcanos Orphei Sermones vulgo exponebat, tum Eleuſinia et Cabirorum Myſteria publicabat. Athenagoræ Legatio, p. 5.

which

which could hurt the national religion. These were the existence of the one supreme Being, and the human extraction of the Dii majorum gentium. He contends, that they did not teach the first, and that the second was not believed to interfere with the vulgar or popular idolatry.

Having quoted a passage from Plutarch, in which he speaks of the system of Euhemerus as subversive of religion, he adds, "It may seem a "little surprizing, that Plutarch should here repre-"sent that as an impious and atheistical doctrine, "which, according to our learned Author, the "Mystagogue taught the initiated *in the greater* "*Mysteries*, and which Cicero and others made no "scruple of declaring [l]."

He thinks it surprising, 1. That the Bishop should assign to the *greater* Mysteries a doctrine, which Plutarch represents as *impious* and *atheistical*. 2. That Plutarch should represent a doctrine as *impious* and *atheistical*, which Cicero *made no scruple of declaring*.

Now we find, that Cicero *made no scruple* of declaring with Plutarch, that this notion of Euhemerus, concerning the origin of the Gods, was *atheistical* and *impious*; and he then adds, that *it was taught in the Samothracian and Eleusinian Mysteries* [m].

As

[l] p. 217.

[m] Quid? qui aut fortes, aut claros, aut potentes viros tradunt post mortem ad deos pervenisse, eosque, esse ipsos quos nos colere, precari, venerarique, soleamus, *nonne expertes sunt religionum omnium?* quæ ratio maxime tractata ab Euhemero est, quem noster et interpretatus, et secutus est, præter cæteros, Ennius. Ab Euhemero autem et mortes et sepulturæ demonstratur deorum. Utrum igitur hic confirmasse religionem videtur, *an penitus totam sustulisse?*

He then adds,

Omitto Eleusinem sanctam illam, et augustam,—prætereo Samothraciam, eaque, quæ

—Lemni

As *surprising* then as it may seem to this ingenious Writer, we have here the authority of *one of the initiated*, to prove that the Mysteries taught the very doctrine, which both Plutarch and himself condemned as *atheistical* and *impious*. And is it any discredit to the Author of the Divine Legation, that he holds the same language with *one of the initiated?*

But, what is more, he who said all this, and gave this most flagitious and execrable doctrine to the Mysteries, always professes the highest veneration and regard for them. What are we then to conclude, (unless we suppose Cicero had lost his senses) but that he looked upon the detection of the error of polytheism *to all the world*, as *atheistical* and *impious*, but when confined to a few under the seal of secrecy, as *very salutary* and *useful?*

And from this conclusion so natural and necessary, we see, that (if we will believe Cicero before this ingenious and learned modern) the Mysteries did confine this secret to a few.

Were it not that error detects, as well as that truth manifests itself, the advocates on both sides would be able to keep up the quarrel between right and wrong to eternity. The Doctor *here* owns, that according to the Bishop's system, the Mystagogue taught the human original of the Gods only to those *initiated in the greater Mysteries*. He must then have taught it to *very few*. Consequently there was no room to charge his Lordship with putting the Mystagogue on the same foot with Euhemerus, who preached this doctrine *promiscuously to all*, assuming the office of Hierophant to the world at large.

——Lemni
Nocturno aditu occulta coluntur
Silvestribus sæpibus densa. Nat. D. 1. 42.

There

There was the less room for this charge, as the Bishop shews, that the Mystagogues themselves treated this doctrine of the detection (when promulged in the manner Euhemerus did it) as *impious* and *atheistical*.

"I readily agree, says the Doctor, that the ill "effects of the vicious examples of the Gods "could not be effectually prevented without over-"turning the vulgar polytheism. But the ancient "Heathens were of a different opinion: *for they* "*thought this might be effectually done by physical* "*and allegorical interpretations of the histories of the* "*Gods*, without rejecting the Deities themselves, "or turning the people from the worship of them [n]."

He agrees that the evil examples of the Gods was an impediment to a good life. But the ANCIENT HEATHENS had another way of mending matters, by the physical and allegorical interpretations just mentioned. We are speaking of the *Mysteries*, and what method the *original* inventors and propagators of them employed to obviate the mischief of the evil example of the Gods. The Bishop says, that the ANCIENT HEATHENS, (*viz.* the priests of the Mysteries) used the detection of the error of polytheism for this purpose. No, says the Doctor, they did not; for the ANCIENT HEATHENS (*viz.* the philosophers who lived many hundred years afterwards) employed another method, *physical* and *allegorical interpretations*.

Even these *late* philosophers were far from thinking this an *effectual* and adequate remedy to the evil in question. Accordingly we find them breaking out, from time to time, into hasty resentments against their capital poets. Hence it was that Plato banished Homer from his republic, and that Pythagoras, in one of his extramundane adventures, saw both Homer and Hesiod doing penance in hell,

[n] p. 234.

 and

and hung up there, for examples, to bleach and purify from the groſſneſs and pollution of their ideas [o].

"I cannot, ſays he, bring myſelf to believe, that "the legiſlator ever intended that there ſhould be "any thing in the Myſteries, which ſhould expoſe "the eſtabliſhed religion and worſhip to contempt. "If Virgil has, according to our Author's moſt "ingenious conjecture, made a genuine repreſen-"tation of the Myſteries, in the 6th book of the "Æneid,

——"*Non temnere divos*,

"was a leſſon carefully inculcated there [p]."

As to "the legiſlator never intending the Myſ-"teries ſhould expoſe the eſtabliſhed religion to "contempt"——Who is this written againſt? not the Biſhop: for the deſign of his whole diſſertation is to ſhew, it was the purpoſe of the legiſlator in the Myſteries to ſkreen the public religion from contempt: and this, by hiding the doctrines, unfavourable to it, from the general body of the initiated.

The *non temnere divos* was a *proclamation* in the LESSER Myſteries, to be told, or, if the Doctor will, *expoſed* to all; but *the origin of the Pagan Gods* was a *ſecret* in the GREATER Myſteries, communicated to a few of the principal aſpirants.

Thus the charge of *contradiction* is removed: for it can only be maintained on the ſuppoſition, that *the ſame* Myſteries, which inculcated the leſſon, *non*

[o] This the Doctor himſelf has obſerved more than once. He ſpeaks of "Fables which Plato repreſents as not fit to "be tolerated in the commonwealth, *whatever allegorical* "*ſenſe may be put upon them.*" p. 370.

He repreſents Plato as teaching, "That the ſtories "which Heſiod and Homer told of the Gods, were per-"nicious and not fit to be heard in a well-ordered com-"monwealth, *whether they are pretended to have had an hid-*"*den allegorical meaning or not.*" p. 159.

[p] p. 239.

temnere divos, opened and displayed the error of the vulgar polytheism.

If it revolt the learned person to suppose, that the greater Mysteries contained a *recantation* of any doctrines taught in the less, let him recollect, that this *recantation* was addressed only to a choice and select number of those who were initiated in the last.

He does indeed charge the Bishop with holding, that *the error of polytheism* was revealed to *all*. But what then? suppose he had charged him with blowing up St. Paul's.

Another of his objections stands thus: "How "could it be said, that in the Mysteries *the secret* "*worship of the Deities* (presiding over them) *was* "*celebrated*, if the *secret doctrine* of those Mysteries "was to shew, that they were no Gods, and that "no worship was due to them at all[q]."

Here our learned Author is at fault, by not distinguishing between the *secret worship* and the *secret doctrine*. Whatever worship was performed in the Mysteries, might in some sense or other be called *secret*. It was *secret*, because celebrated in conventions which had the name of Mysteries. It was *secret*, because confined only to the initiated, or to all within the walls of the sacred edifice. Thus the general and solemn worship in *the lesser Mysteries*, or the worship extending to *the whole body of the initiated*, which was paid only to the national idols; might be called *secret*, in opposition to the public and open worship, with which they were celebrated by all the people. But how could the *secret worship* of the lesser Mysteries be affected by the *secret doctrine* of the greater? Those who celebrated the first, were not let into, or made acquainted with, the last.

[q] p. 241.

However it was enough for the learned Writer, where he found a ſameneſs of *name*, to fabricate it into a ſameneſs of *nature*, and ſo to charge the Biſhop with contradiction in affirming, that the *ſecret worſhip* of their Deities was celebrated, and yet that the *ſecret doctrine* was to ſhew, that they deſerved no worſhip.

"Why, ſays he, did not the fathers, in their "diſputes with the Heathens, argue from their "own Myſteries againſt the popular idolatry?[r]" This indeed ſeems a moſt commodious way of confutation; and by the like argument I would prove the Pagans not guilty of idolatry. It is only ASKING, *Why the fathers, in their diſputes with the Heathens, did not accuſe them of idolatry?* The Doctor will ſay, they did accuſe them. And does he ſuppoſe the ſame anſwer will not be given here? *They did argue from their own Myſteries againſt the popular idolatry.*

They maintained that the Gentile Gods were deceaſed mortals, and conſequently not the proper objects of the divine honour and worſhip paid to them. The Pagans denied the premiſes, and, in order to evade the charge of the human origin of the Gods, allegorized their hiſtory, and pretended, that the ſeveral circumſtances of it were deſigned for the vehicle of *phyſical*, *moral*, and *divine* truths. For they were not extravagant enough to think of maintaining their divinity, on the ſuppoſition that they had once been men. Here the fathers appeal to the Myſteries, as declaring, that they were dead men deified[s]. For their human original being once proved, the error of their worſhip, or of the

[r] p. 243.

[s] Ex ipſis itaque Myſteriis intelligere debuerunt hominibus ſe mortuis ſupplicare. Lactantius de Falſ. Rel. 1. 20. vide too c. 15. It is uſual with Cyprian, Auſtin, Minucius, Felix, &c. to argue from the ſame topic.

vulgar

vulgar polytheism, was allowed on both sides to follow of course.

Asserting therefore, that the Mysteries detected the human birth and condition of the greater Gods, (and this assertion was eternally repeated by the fathers) was asserting, that they discovered the vanity and illusion of the common polytheism.

Tatian mentions some books of *Diagoras*, in which he treated the popular Divinities with as much freedom as any of the primitive apologists. He reproaches the Pagans with contradiction and inconsistency, because they expressed the highest indignation against the Christians for rejecting their Gods as lies, nonsense, and imposture, and yet permitted men to read the books of *Diagoras* with impunity. [t] A learned critic thinks these are the books in which he is said to have ridiculed and exposed the Mysteries: not content with having made them the subject of derision and contempt in his common conversation [u]. If this conjecture be well founded, and it appears from the context to be extremely probable, it will follow, that when *Tatian* argues *from these books*, he argues *from the Mysteries* against the vulgar idolatry.

But suppose the fathers had omitted to employ this argument from the Pagan Mysteries against the Pagan idolatries, what follows but that they did not make the best of their cause? that they *might*

[t] Diagoras Atheniensis erat; sed quod Mysteria apud Atheniensis prophanasset, punitus est: hujus *Phrygios libros cum legatis, nos odistis*, et eum Leonis commentarios servetis, nostras redargutiones ægre fertis. (Tatian contra Græcos.)

[u] Vossius, referring to the passage just quoted, says, Phrygios sermones fuisse arbitror historiam eorum, quæ ad Cybelen, sive matrem Phrygiam, et ejus sacra pertinerent; atque ab eo esse hoc fine conscriptam, ut a sacris illius homines averteret. De Historicis Græcis, p. 436.

have

Inde hominum pecudumque genus, vitæque volantum,
Et quæ marmoreo fert monstra sub æquore pontus [b].

Dr. Middleton indeed very frankly owns that the Mysteries taught the Unity [c]. But, if I remember right, the late Bishop of Exeter warmly espouses our Author's interpretation of the 6th Æneid, and yet strenuously maintains, that the Mysteries had nothing to do with the doctrine in question. In other words, he strenuously maintains that the verses here quoted are spurious.

Dr. Leland asserts, p. 301, "That the Egyptians did not reason out the principles of their theology, but professed to have derived it from tradition, *which they kept as a secret to themselves, and carefully concealed from the people.*" At the same time he confesses, that the Unity was part of the *private* and *arcane* theology, which was thus studiously secreted from the vulgar. It must then have been the hidden doctrine of the Mysteries. For that the *private* and *arcane* theology of the Egyptians was delivered in their Mysteries, will admit of no question [d].

It is well known, that the serpent was made one of the representatives of the supreme Being, on account of its spirit, vigour, activity, long life, and revirescence. *Philo Byblius* speaks of it as endued

[b] As to the difference between the *universal nature or spirit, pervading all things*, which was taught in the Mysteries, and the *Grecian* notion of the *anima mundi*, or *universal soul*, vide Divine Legation, vol. ii. p. 239, 240.

[c] "The reverence with which he (Cicero) always speaks of these Mysteries, and the hints he has dropt of their end and use, seem to confirm what a very learned and ingenious Writer has delivered of them, that they were contrived to incalcate *the Unity of God, and the immortality of the soul.*" Vol. i. p. 44. Life of Cicero.

[d] In *Egypt the hidden doctrines* of the Mysteries, and *the arcane theology* of the philosophers, were one and the same. In Greece they were very different. Vide Divine Legation, vol. ii. p. 106.

with

with all these qualities, and *therefore used in the Mysteries*. He says, "The Phænicians call it the "good Dæmon, and the *Egyptians* to the same "purpose, *Cneph* [e]." Now we know that the Egyptians by *Cneph* meant the supreme Being, or first Cause of all things [f]. The supreme Being therefore must have been the object of their Mysteries.

He adds, "*Epeis*, the principal and most distin-"guished of the Egyptian Hierophants, declares, "that *the first and most divine of all Beings*, was "represented by this symbol [g]." As then we have shewn, that this symbol was employed in the Mysteries, we have the authority of the hierophant himself to prove, that the Unity was taught there.

It could not, indeed, be otherwise, since this animal was used in the Mysteries *on account of those very qualities*, which were supposed to render it the proper symbol and representative of the supreme God.

We will now proceed to his Lordship's testimonies. "The Egyptians, says Clemens, did not use

[e] Diuturnæ admodum vitæ est, nec solum exuto senio juvenescit, verum etiam majora corporis simul et virium accipit incrementa, donec tandum confecto certo quodam annorum curriculo in seipsum iterum dissolvatur, quemadmodum *in sacris etiam tabulis idem Taautus scriptum reliquit. Id quod in causa fuit cur* hoc animantium genus *in sacris pariter atque Mysteriis adhiberi soleret*. Illud quidem Phænices bonum Dæmonem, Ægyptii vero Cnephum similiter nuncuparunt, eidemque caput accipitris ob præcipuam quandam hujus volucris agendi vim addiderunt. Philo Byblius in Euseb. Præp. Evang. 1. 10.

[f] Τον δημιουργον, ον κνηφ, οι Αιγυπτιοι προσαγορευουσιν. Euseb. P. Ev. 3, 11.

[g] Quinetiam Epeis ille, *qui summus ab iis sacrorum interpres* (ιεροφαντης) et scriba nominatur, quemque Arius Heracleopolites lingua Græca donavit, sic ad verbum rem istam allegorice exposuit, *unus omnium maxime divinus* (το πρωτον ον θειοτατον) erat serpens ille qui accipitris formam præ se ferebat. Euseb. P. Ev. 1. 10.

"to reveal their Mysteries indiscriminately to all, "nor expose *their truths concerning divine matters* "*to the prophane*, but to those who were to succeed "to the administration of the state, and to *such of* "*the priests as were most approved by their education,* "*learning and quality* [h]."

"*Chrysippus* says, that the secret *doctrines concern-* "*ing divine matters*, are rightly called ΤΕΛΕΤΑΙ, "for that these are the last things the initiated "should be informed of: the soul having gained "an able support, and, being possessed of her "desires, can keep silent before the uninitiated and "prophane." To the same purpose, Clemens, "The doctrines delivered in the *greater* Mysteries, "are concerning the universe. Here all instruc- "tion ends. Things are seen as they are, and *na-* "*ture*, and the things of nature are given to be "comprehended [i]."

It may at first seem doubtful whether Clemens in the last quotation means the *cosmical* or the *theological* nature. But this he perfectly clears up in the next passage, informing us, that *the first intelligence* or supreme cause of all things, was offered to the contemplation of the initiated. Επι την πρωτην νοησιν προχωρουντες δι' αναλυσεως, εκ των υποκειμενων αυτω τεν αρχην ποιουμενοι, procedentes *ad primam intelligentiam* per resolutionem, ex iis quæ sunt ei subjecta ducentes initium [k].

Though the two passages first cited do not *explicitly* point out the Unity as the grand object of the Mysteries, yet it is amazing so very perspicacious a writer as Dr. Leland should not see that they do it *implicitly*.

[h] Divine Legation, p. 163. Clemens Alex. Strom. 5. p. 566. Ed. Par.
[i] Divine Legation, p. 163.
[k] p. 582. Ed. Par.

In

In the first, Clemens declares, that the Mysteries inculcated some religious principles, or *truths concerning divine matters*, which could be imparted only to persons eminent for their birth, rank, and station, or distinguished by their education, merit, and learning. The arcana then of the Mysteries must have included the best, soundest, and most rational part of the Egyptian theology. The only question therefore will be, Whether this theology taught the doctrine of the Unity? And this can be no question with those, who are conversant in the antient learning and theological systems of Egypt [1].

As for Chrysippus, he says these *secret religious doctrines* are rightly called Τελεται, which signifies either the Mysteries, or the *last* and *final* things. They must then have opened and explained the *last* and *final things*, or have given *all the instruction and information in divine matters*, which was necessary to perfect men in religious knowledge. Consequently they taught the chief and principal branch of this knowledge, or the notion of the supreme cause of all things.

He might have his eye on the more correct and exact account which the Mysteries gave of the popular Gods. But as he declares they gave all the information in divine matters necessary to perfect men in religious knowledge, he could not but extend their instruction to the Unity.

[1] This can be no question with the learned Doctor, because he maintains, that "the Egyptian theology, derived "from ancient tradition, *which they kept as a secret to them-"selves, and carefully concealed from the people*," taught the principle of the Unity. vol. i. p. 301.

Clemens was so far from denying the Egyptians this doctrine, that he seems determined to assert it to them at all adventures. Sometimes he pretends they stole it from Moses and the prophets, and sometimes, that they had it *by the Revelation of Angels from Heaven*. Strom. passim.

The learned Doctor makes ſhort work with, and ſtrikes out by one ſingle daſh of his pen, the three teſtimonies juſt recited, as wholly trifling and inſignificant to the point in diſpute. "All we can "gather from them, ſays he, is that the Myſteries "treated of *divine matters*, of the *nature of the* "*Gods*, and of *the univerſe*, but they have not one "word to ſhew, that the doctrine of the Unity was "there [m]." To make good theſe aſſertions, he muſt ſhew firſt, that *the firſt intelligence* is not the ſame with the one true God. 2. He muſt prove againſt himſelf, and all antiquity, that the Unity was not taught in the private and arcane theology of Egypt: And 3dly, That it was not diſcovered in the time of Chryſippus. For, if it was diſcovered in his time, he could not but hold it neceſſary to perfect and complete men in ſacred and religious knowledge.

I ſhall here tranſcribe a paſſage of Plutarch, brought by his Lordſhip to ſhew, that the Myſteries were invented, eſtabliſhed, and ſupported by *lawgivers*. For it is equally calculated to ſhew, that they taught the Unity. "It was, ſays Plu-"tarch, a moſt ancient opinion delivered down, "from *legiſlators* and divines, to poets and philo-"ſophers, the author of it entirely unknown, but "the belief of it indelibly eſtabliſhed, not only in "tradition, and the talk of the vulgar, but in the "MYSTERIES, and *in the ſacred offices of religion*, "both amongſt Greeks and Barbarians, ſpread all "over the face of the globe, That the univerſe "was not upheld fortuitouſly, without mind, rea-"ſon, or a governor to preſide over its revolu-"tions [n]."

I produce this paſſage with the more confidence, becauſe the very learned Doctor has himſelf ſince

[m] p. 221.

[n] Divine Legation, p. 209.

brought

brought it to ſhew, *the notion of the one ſupreme God was never intirely extinguiſhed in the Pagan world* [o]. I ſhall truſt to his known candour and ingenuity to own, that if it proves this againſt the deiſts, it muſt equally prove againſt himſelf the main point which we are now controverting.

Again, Plutarch, in this ſame tract of Iſis and Oſiris, ſpeaking of the temperance, and the rigid and auſtere ceremonies, required of the aſpirants to the Myſteries of Iſis, ſays, "The end of theſe "is to attain the knowledge of *the ſupreme Being*, "and *Lord of all things*, whom the Goddeſs ex-"horts them to inquire after, as dwelling and "abiding with her. On this account her temple is "called *Iſcion*, in alluſion to the knowledge of the "ſelf-exiſtent Being, which may be acquired there "by thoſe who approach it with *prudence* and *ſanc-"tity* [p]."

Here the Doctor objects, that the Biſhop ſhould lay no ſtreſs on the authority of this tract of Iſis and Oſiris. For that he holds, "It was directly "written to ſupport the national religion, and to "ſhew, that all its multiform worſhip, was only "an addreſs to the ſupreme Being, under various "names and covers [q]."

He owns the Biſhop "has very well expoſed "Plutarch's ſcheme, and the ſhifts he was put up-"on to ſupport it." In arguing againſt the deiſts, he condeſcends to accept the Biſhop's account of the ſcope and deſtination of this piece, and declares the whole of it is manifeſtly deſigned for the purpoſe above mentioned [r]. But, notwithſtanding this, he holds himſelf authorized to quote from it on ſeveral occaſions, more particularly with regard

[o] Vol. i. p. 83.
[p] Iſis and Oſiris, ſect. 2.
[q] p. 222.
[r] p. 425.

to

to the Pagan doctrine of the Unity. And can so candid a Writer have any thought of arrogating this exclusive privilege to himself, and denying it to all others? especially to the Author, to whom he owns himself indebted for all he knows of the purpose and design of this work.

He thinks no stress should be laid on Plutarch's treatise of Isis and Osiris, because it was written to support Paganism. By the same reason, no stress is to be laid on the authority of the fathers, because their works were composed to support Christianity. —But, let me ask, Does not common sense direct us to distinguish and shew what is to be doubted and what admitted in writers for a cause or party? Plutarch endeavours to blanch Paganism by allegorical interpretations of the invention of his brother priests, and of his own. But are we to conceive, that either would be so shameless as to affirm, that such and such things were taught in their rites, if they were not taught there? What infidel ever doubted that the particular doctrines were held by the church, which the ecclesiastical writers of the several ages deliver historically to us?

How did the learned Doctor relish the same sort of objection, when urged by Lord Bolingbroke, to shew that no credit was due to the ancient Pagan testimonies collected by Josephus?

But to proceed. His Lordship has cited the following passage from Galen's Tract *of the use of the parts of the human body*. "The study, therefore, "of the use of the parts, is not only of service to "the *mere physician*, but of much greater to him "who joins *philosophy* to the art of healing; and, "in order to perfect himself in this Mystery, la-"bours to investigate the *universal nature* [1]. They, "who initiate themselves here, whether private men

[1] Ολη φυσις.

"or bodies, will find, in my opinion, nobler in-
"ſtruction than in the rites either of *Eleuſis* or
"*Samothrace* [t]."

We are told here, that the ολη φυσις, or *univerſal nature*, might be learned either by the aſpirant in the Myſteries, or by *the philoſopher* in the ſtudy of the frame and ſtructure of the human body. But the learned in antiquity well know, that the ολη φυσις, or *univerſal nature*, was the ſame with *the firſt intelligence*, or the ſupreme cauſe of all things.

It appears from the tour of the paſſage, that the Myſteries preſented the ſame idea of a God, which the philoſopher diſcovered in ſtudying the ſtructure of the body, or contemplating the works of the creation. And, what was the idea of God, which, according to Galen, the philoſopher deduced by this medium? Why, he informs us in this very book, that it was the idea of a Being infinitely wiſe, good, and powerful [u].

Here

[t] Divine Legation, p. 165.

[u] "I conceive piety and true religion towards God to
"conſiſt in this, not that I ſhould ſacrifice many heca-
"tombs, or burn much incenſe to him, but that I ſhould
"myſelf acknowledge, and then declare to others, how
"great his *wiſdom* is, how great his *power*, and how great
"his *goodneſs*. For that he would adorn the whole world
"after this manner, envying to nothing that good which
"it is capable of, I conclude to be a demonſtration of
"moſt abſolute goodneſs, and thus let him be praiſed by
"us as good. And that he was able to find out how all
"things might be adorned after the beſt manner, is a ſign
"of the greateſt wiſdom in him. And laſtly, to be able to
"effect and bring to paſs all thoſe things which he had
"thus decreed, argues an inſuperable power."——I have given this paſſage from Galen in Cudworth's tranſlation. Vide Intellectual Syſtem, p. 444.

Varro too declares, that the *philoſophical* idea of a God, was the idea of a Being preſiding over the whole ſyſtem, and governing and directing all things by his wiſdom and power. Hi ſoli Varroni videntur animadvertiſſe quid eſſet Deus,

Here again the Doctor objects, that "Galen says "nothing by which we can form a judgment, whether the Mysteries instructed men in the doctrine "of the Unity [v]." And to this I shall readily accede, if he can shew, that the ancients held more *universal natures*, or more unoriginated, independent, and self-existent Beings than one [x]. For we have just shewn, that this is the notion of the Deity which Galen assigns to the Mysteries.

Strabo says, "*The secret celebration of the Mysteries*, PRESERVES THE MAJESTY DUE TO THE "DIVINITY, *and, at the same time, imitates its nature, which hides itself from our senses.*" Upon this his Lordship remarks as follows: "A plain in-

Deus, qui crediderunt eum esse animam motu ac ratione mundum gubernantem. Aug. de Civ. Dei.

[v] p. 223.

[x] The Doctor, in disparagement of the notion of the Unity taught in the Mysteries, says, "It can hardly be "supposed the magistrates and great men of the state had "more right notions of the Divinity than the philosophers, who had very wrong ones." p. 196.

I must take the liberty to remind him, that, in the Egyptian priest, the two characters of *legislator* and *philosopher* were incorporated, and went together. In Egypt, therefore, *the hidden doctrines* of the Mysteries, and the *arcana* of the schools, must have been one and the same. Divine Legation, vol. ii. p. 106.

Now the Egyptian sages could have no very gross conceptions of the Deity, since they represented him as a spirit diffusing itself through the world, and pervading all things by its virtue and power. Divine Legation, vol. ii. p. 229.

In Greece the case was very different. The two characters of *legislator* and *philosopher* were always kept distinct, and conducted on different principles. The consequence is, that the *hidden doctrines* of the Mysteries, and the arcana of the schools, were separate and distinct things. But then, unfortunately for the Doctor's distinction, the advantage was on the side of the legislators and statesmen. For these, while aiming at their professed end, *the promotion of utility*, were not likely to concern themselves with those *metaphysical speculations* concerning God and the soul, which were the opprobrium of the Greek philosophy.

"tination

" timation of the nature of the secret. And had
" there been any ambiguity, he presently removes
" it, where, speaking of the different faculties ex-
" ercised in the different rites of religion, he makes
" *philosophy* to be the object of the Mysteries [y]."

Dr. Leland replies, that " by the Divinity
" Strabo does not seem to understand the one su-
" preme God, as distinguished from the inferior
" Deities; but the Divinity, in whose name, and
" to whose honour, the Mysteries were celebrated,
" such as Apollo, Ceres, and Bacchus, of whom
" he immediately after makes mention [z]."

The word used in the original is το θειον, which often signifies the one supreme God, in opposition to the inferior Deities [a].

It is natural to believe it signifies the supreme God in this place, because Chrysippus, Galen, Clemens, concur in affirming that the best and soundest part of the Pagan theology, more particularly that part of it which taught the *first intelligence*, *universal nature*, or father and maker of the world, was delivered in the Mysteries.

But says the Doctor, " I cannot find upon a
" careful examination of the passage, as it lies in
" the original, that Strabo represents *philosophy* as
" the object about which the Mysteries are conver-
" sant.——But allowing it to be so, since he does
" not explain *what philosophy it was*, it would leave
" us still in the dark. For that the philosophers
" were far from agreeing in their notions of the

[y] p. 164. [z] p. 222.

[a] Redditur etiam το θειον sæpe Deus, sed ita tamen ut intelligendum sit, non de quolibet deo, ab ipsis etiam profanis scriptoribus dici, verum de eo quem intelligerent cum θεον dicebant quasi κατ' εξοχην, ad differentiam eorum, qui multi appellatione θεων includebantur, summum videlicet supremumque numen. Hen. Step. Thesaurus Græc. Ling. tom. i. p. 1534.

" Divinity, ſufficiently appears from Cicero's cele-
" brated book *de Natura Deorum* [b]."

To this I reply, upon the moſt careful examination of the context, I find nothing, to which the *philoſophizing* there mentioned, can be applied, but to the Myſteries: and as the Doctor does not point out *any other object*, I am the more confirmed in believing, that it is applicable to theſe only. Beſides, Galen declares, that the *philoſophical* idea of the Divinity was the object of the Myſteries [c].

And as Galen has ſo preciſely marked out the philoſophical idea of the Divinity, or declared it to be the Idea of the Maker and Creator of the World, we need be in no pain for any thing which our learned Author may produce from *Cicero de Natura Deorum*, or any other quarter of antiquity. He muſt have recourſe to ſome monuments not yet extant, if he will ſhew that the theiſtical philoſophers held more unoriginated and ſelf exiſtent Beings than one.

His Lordſhip preſents us, with the following teſtimony of Joſephus: " Where, in any place
" but in this, (Judæa) are *the whole people*, by
" the ſpecial diligence of the prieſt, to whom
" the care of public inſtruction is committed,
" accurately taught the principles of true piety?
" So that the body-politic ſeems, as it were,
" *one great aſſembly*, conſtantly kept together, for

[b] p. 222.

[c] The learned Bayle, who was as poorly and meanly prejudiced againſt the Pagan Myſteries, as any of thoſe zealous fathers of the church, whom he moſt deſpiſed, was yet ingenuous enough to own, *on the teſtimony of this paſſage in Strabo*, that they taught the doctrine of the Unity. Les Paiens diſoient que les ſecrets des Myſteres *font paroître Dieu plus majeſtieux, et qu'ils ſont une image de ſa nature*, vu qu'il eſt caché a nos ſens. Myſtica ſacrorum occultatio majeſtatem numini conciliat, &c. Strabo, l. 10.——Diction. vol. iii. Socin.

" the

" the celebration of ſome ſacred *Myſteries*. For " thoſe things which the Gentiles keep up for a " few days only, that is, during thoſe ſolemnities " they call MYSTERIES and INITIATIONS, we, " with vaſt delight, and a plenitude of knowledge, " which admits of no error, fully enjoy, and per- " petually contemplate, through the whole courſe " of our lives. If you aſk the nature of thoſe " things, which in our ſacred rites are enjoined and " forbidden, I anſwer they are ſimple and eaſily " underſtood. The firſt inſtruction relates to the " *Deity*, and teaches, that *God contains all things*, " and is a Being every way perfect and happy; " that he is ſelf-exiſtent, and the ſole cauſe of all " exiſtence, &c. [d] "

Joſephus was engaged in controverſy with the learned Pagans. The Doctor ſays, they boaſted of their Initiations and Myſteries, as containing the moſt ſacred and venerable part of their religion [e]. As then the Unity was one part of their religion [f], they muſt have aſſerted this doctrine to the Myſteries. And how does Joſephus anſwer this part of their argument, when called upon to ſet forth the ſuperior advantage of the Jewiſh religion over the Pagan? Why, he does not inſiſt, that the one had, and the other had not, this doctrine; but aſſerts two prerogatives to the firſt, from *the different manner of teaching it*. For that this taught the Unity to *all its followers* without diſtinction, and *at all times and ſeaſons*. On the other hand, the Pagan religion imparted it to *very few*, during the *rare* and *temporary* celebration of the Myſteries.

[d] Divine Legation, p. 166.

[e] p. 225.

[f] Joſephus well knew that this was part of their religion, as he aſſerts, that the more learned Pagans entertained *the ſame idea of the ſupreme Being with Moſes*. Cont. Ap. 2. 16. 31.

To confirm this I ſhall add, that in ſetting forth the ſuperior excellency of the Jewiſh religion, he had nothing to argue from with reſpect to the Uni y, but the different mode of teaching it. He declared as ſtrongly as his adverſaries, that the learned Gentiles had this doctrine, and affirms, that they entertained the ſame notion of the ſupreme Being with Moſes. He does not allow them this knowledge *by way of conceſſion*, ſince he appeals to the very paſſage, in which Plato declares this doctrine could not be intruſted to the people [g].

Thus we are debarred the liberty of allowing with the Doctor, that Joſephus was cajoling the Gentiles [h], or *gratuitouſly* arguing on their own repreſentation of the Myſteries, when he ſuppoſes that they taught the ſame notion of the Unity with the Moſaic law.

If he was *cajoling the Pagans*, who generally gave this account of their Myſteries, we ſhall have *the concurrent evidence of the Pagans* to ſhew, that the Myſteries taught the Unity. This is the very thing the Biſhop undertook to prove. The Doctor contradicts him. In the rage of contradiction, before he is aware, himſelf aſſerts the very fact he was controverting, and in order to take away one witneſs, fairly gives his adverſary all the reſt.

The eminent Writer goes on thus: "It is obſervable that Joſephus does not enter upon the "conſideration of the nature and deſign of theſe "Myſteries, or the doctrines that were taught there,

[g] Cont. Ap. l. 2. 16. 31.

He well knew, that he could not more effectually expoſe the impotence and inefficacy of the religious wiſdom of the Pagans, than by ſhewing, that *when they knew God*, they were unable to make a proper uſe of this knowledge, or *to glorify him as God* by preaching him up as the object of the public and national religion.

[h] p. 225.

"though

" though he is very plain and expreſs in the ac-
" count he gives of the principles the Jews were
" taught in their laws, particularly relating to the
" one true, abſolutely perfect God, the ſole cauſe
" of all exiſtence [i]."

This is truly pleaſant. I will ſuppoſe ſome of our hiſtorians to have ſaid, the Saxons invaded, ravaged, and then conquered Britain, juſt as the Franks did Gaul. I will ſuppoſe too the public had generally acquieſced in this hiſtorian's aſſertion. After this comes a critic, and ſays, Gentlemen, you are all miſtaken; this cannot be the hiſtorian's meaning; if it had, he would have given you the hiſtory of Pharamond, as he has done that of Hengiſt and Herſa.

" Nor do I well ſee, ſays the learned Doctor,
" how a Jewiſh prieſt ſhould be a competent wit-
" neſs to inform us of what was the principal ſe-
" cret of the Pagan Myſteries, and which they were
" bound under the moſt tremendous ſeal of ſecrecy
" not to reveal [k]." He well knew, as appears from this treatiſe, that the Unity was one part of the *private* and *arcane* theology, which the Pagans dare not lay before the people. And as " they
" boaſted, that their Myſteries and Initiations,
" contained the moſt ſacred and venerable doc-
" trines of their religion," how could he help ſeeing, that they boaſted of their Myſteries and Initiations as teaching the Unity?

The Doctor is very right in obſerving, that *the initiated were bound under the moſt tremendous ſeal of ſecrecy*, not to reveal the arcana of the Myſteries. And for a long time this might be kept inviolate. But in the decline of Paganiſm, when Joſephus wrote, the ſecret had tranſpired, and been often mentioned in the writings of the learned.

[i] p. 225. [k] ibid.

There

There was nothing the patrons of the Myſteries were more ſtudious of concealing than the human original of the Gods. And yet, if we may judge by Tully, even the more virtuous and ſober part of the initiated made no ſcruple of declaring in their writings, that this was one of the arcana of the Myſteries.

The curious and inquiſitive among the ancients, had been long in poſſeſſion of writings, which gave ſufficient information of the ſecrets in queſtion.

The Biſhop has ſhewn, not by conjecture, but by poſitive and direct teſtimony, that *the fragment of Sanchoniathon* contains the very *hiſtory* which was read in the *greater* Myſteries [l].

We find frequent mention in ancient writers of a piece entitled Ιερος λογος, or *the Holy Oration.* It is ſometimes attributed to Orpheus, and ſometimes to Telauges, Pythagoras, or one of his early followers [m]. We are told, that this work included an account of *the arcane doctrines which Pythagoras learned from Aglaſphamus the Myſtagogue, when he was initiated into the Thracian Myſteries* [n].

Fabricius, ſpeaking of ſome works of Orpheus called Τελεται, or *the Myſteries*, ſays, Traditam in illis credibile eſt Orphicorum *ſacrorum et* οργιασμων *rationem.* Ob hæc ipſa ſcripta et Theogoniam, videtur potiſſimum Orpheus apud Virgilium tuliſſe nomen *Threicii ſacerdotis*, et apud alios θεολογου. [o]

Again, notwithſtanding the arcana were delivered to the initiated under the moſt awful and ſolemn ſeal of ſecrecy, yet there are many on record for having betrayed them in direct violation of the moſt ſacred

[l] p. 175.
[m] Jamblichus de Vita Pythag. Diogenes Laertius, l. 91. 98.
[n] Jamblichus de Vita Pythag. 1. 146. Proclus in Timæum Platonis, l. 5. p. 291.
[o] Biblioth. Græca, vol. i. p. 128.

engage-

engagements to the contrary. And no doubt, but many others, unrecorded and unnoticed in hiſtory, might be guilty of the ſame impiety. The magiſtrate would indeed exert himſelf to ſuppreſs the propagation of this ſecret: he might ſo far ſucceed as to hinder it from ſpreading amongſt the populace; but the more prying and ſagacious muſt have ſeen much farther than he could have wiſhed. Very authentic accounts of the diſcoveries made by Alexander and Diagoras had been preſerved amongſt the learned, and handed down to the time of Tatian, Athenagoras, &c.

Beſides, the Doctor has obſerved, that the Jews, from the time of the captivity, to the coming of our Saviour, had been uſeful in ſpreading the knowledge of the true God amongſt the Gentiles [p]. Now amongſt the many illuſtrious converts made to Judaiſm, we may reaſonably preſume that ſome had been previouſly initiated in the Pagan Myſteries. And why might not the Jews learn from theſe the arcana in queſtion?

We will now examine what our learned Author has advanced on the authority of the fathers, to ſhew that the Myſteries did not teach the Unity.

He ſays, "The primitive Chriſtians are not to "be blamed for the bad opinion they had of "the Pagan Myſteries [q]." And in what did this bad opinion conſiſt? Why, firſt, in ſuppoſing they were a ſink of the groſſeſt impiety and atheiſm. 2dly, That they, in their firſt and original conſtitution, promoted and encouraged all ſorts of licentiouſneſs and debauchery.

He lays his main ſtreſs on *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who concludes his long and flaming invective againſt the Myſteries in theſe words: "Theſe are "the Myſteries of *atheiſtical men*. I may rightly

[p] Vol. i. p. 437.

[q] Argument of c. 9.

"call

" call those ATHEISTS, who are destitute of the " knowledge of him who is truly God, and most " impudently worship a boy discerped, or torn in " pieces by the Titans, a woman lamenting, and " the parts which modesty forbids to name."—— " And he repeats it again, that they are ignorant " of God, αγνοουσι τον θεον, and do not acknowledge " that God who really is or exists [r]."

When he says, " These are the Mysteries of *atheistical men*," he must in the last words include the institutors, conductors, and participants of the Mysteries. Now these will include all the more virtuous, rational, and thinking part of the ancient Pagans [s]. What he affirms then is, that all the more virtuous, rational, and thinking part of the Gentiles,

[r] p. 245.

[s] It was so customary for all the Pagans of superior and distinguished characters to be initiated, that the learned Bently made no scruple to assert Socrates must have been one of the number. Collins had said, " Socrates made " Mysteries no part of his religion." To this the great Critic replies, " No Mysteries! A wager with our writer, " that he was initiated in the Mysteries of Ceres Eleu- " sina."—Remarks on Collins, part ii. p. 178. However we are as certain, as history can make us, that Socrates was not initiated. V. Lucian and Diogenes Laertius.

On the other hand, one of *the more early* Writers against the *Divine Legation* maintained, that Socrates did not mean to express any very favourable opinion of the Mysteries, even in the passage which the Bishop produced to shew, that he conceived highly and honourably of the institutors of these rites. " In my opinion, says Socrates, those who esta- " blished the Mysteries, whoever they were, *were well* " *skilled in human nature*. For in these rites it was of old " signified to the aspirants, that those who died without " being initiated, stuck fast in mire and filth; but that " he who was purified and initiated, at his death should " have his habitation with the Gods." Divine Legation, p. 185.

The original is, κ᾽ κινδυνευουσι κ᾽ οι τας τελεταις καταστησαντες, ου φαυλοι τινες ειναι——

The

Gentiles, were chargeable with *impiety* and *atheism*. In other words, *there was nothing but Atheism and impiety in the Gentile world.* And will the authority of a father, or even all the fathers in conjunction, be deemed sufficient to establish a charge so very atrocious, malignant, and incredible?

As he holds Clemens *blameless* for advancing this charge, he must hold Chrysippus, Strabo, Galen, Plutarch, extremely *blameable* for having spoke so

The objector thought, that Socrates could not intend to express much regard for the institutors of these rites, as he says only, that they were ου φαυλοι, i. e. literally, *not mean* or *contemptible* persons. But he should have known that in the Greek and Latin languages, the negation of ill is used to signify the highest good. Livy, speaking of Polybius, calls him haudquaquam spernendus auctor *, i. e. an author of the *first rank and distinction*. Homer calls Achilles, ουκ αφαυροτατος Αχαιων †, *not the worst soldier of the Greeks*, meaning, we know, *the best*. Herodotus says, ου τω ασθενεστατω σοφιστη Πυθαγορη ‡, literally a philosopher *not of the meanest authority*; but we all know it was his intention to say, he was a philosopher *of far greater authority than all others*.

Had the objector never heard of these things? Aut ILLAUDATI nescit BUSIRIDIS aras? The same figure is often used in holy Scripture. "*The Lord will not hold him* "*guiltless*, who taketh his name in vain;" i. e. will look upon him as *a most flagrant* and *atrocious* offender, and punish him in *a most severe* and *exemplary* manner.——"Ye "know that your labour shall not be *in vain*;" i. e. shall be *amply* and *liberally* rewarded.——St. Paul, enumerating the transgressions of the Gentiles, speaks of "men "working with men those things *which are not convenient or seemly*," τα μη καθηκοντα, designing to signify *the most flagitious* and *detestable* of all vices. (Romans i. 28.) Our Saviour declares, that they "who teach men to "break any of his commandments, shall be *the least* in "the kingdom of Heaven;" i. e. they, *least of all men*, were to expect a portion in this kingdom, or they, of all men, should be *the farthest* from ever entering into it. (Matthew v. 19.)

* L. 30. 45. † 15th Iliad. ‡ L. 4. Sect. 95.

 favour-

favourably, as they have done, of the Mysteries. For they speak of them as teaching the Unity, and all the sublime and important truths, which were necessary to perfect men in religious knowledge.

If he be singular enough to fancy the authority of Clemens superior to that of the great and respectable names just recited, I must beg leave to add another, which, by his own confession, will be satisfactory and decisive. And that is the authority of Clemens himself, who *often* speaks as highly and honourably of the Mysteries, as any of their warmest encomiasts in the Pagan world.

In one of the citations above [t], he assures us, that they taught the existence of the one God, or the supreme cause of all things.

In another [u], he represents them as opening all the treasures of sacred and divine truths, which were most prized and valued by the best and wisest of the ancient Egyptian sages. Having just observed, that none but persons of the most eminent and exalted virtue were raised to the higher offices in the *Jewish church*, he adds, that "*on this account*, or, in *imitation of this practice*, "the Egyptians did not communicate their Myste-"ries promiscuously to all, but only to those who "were to succeed to the administration of the state, "and to such of the priests as were most approved "for their *education*, *learning* and *quality*." Thus the mystagogues were engaged in the noblest office of humanity, or the dispensing the purest and brightest rays of religious light and knowledge to all who were able to receive them.

Again he declares, "That certain lustrations were

[t] Vide above, p. 34. a passage quoted from l. 5, Strom. in which the Mysteries are said to offer *the first intelligence* to the contemplation of the initiated.

[u] Above, p. 34. Clem. Al. p. 566.

"proper

"proper before initiation. For that it was the "province of the Mysteries to cleanse and purify "the minds of the aspirants *from the impious and* "*erroneous opinions*, with which they were previ-"ously imbued, and to convert them to the truth [w]."

He sometimes describes the Mysteries as a sage and excellent provision, well adapted to the blindness and infirmity of human nature, which render the generality of men unable to bear the truth [x].

Speaking of the adyta, or retired apartments in the Egyptian temples, in which the Mysteries were celebrated, he puts them on the same foot with *the part of the Jewish temple over which the veil was cast*, as if both had been intended to signify, that the more profound and sacred doctrines of religion, were not to be laid before the people. He must suppose then, that the aspirants had the same advantage over the uninitiated, with regard to religious knowledge, which the high-priest, by his access to *the holy of holies*, had over the vulgar Jews [y].

The

[w] Επει κ᾽ προ της των μυστηριων παραδοσεως, καθαρμους τινας προσαγειν τοις μυεισθαι μελλουσιν αξιουσιν. ως δεον, την αθεον αποθεμενους δοξαν, επι την αληθη τρεπεσθαι παραδοσιν.

Ante Mysteriorum traditionem lustrationes quasdam adhibendas initiari volentibus censent. Ut pote, quum oporteat, *impiam deponentes opinionem, ad veram converti traditionem.* Strom. 7. 714.

[x] p. 555. He here speaks of them as hiding and secreting their doctrines from popular knowledge per modum occultationis, *qui est vere divinus, et maxime nobis necessarius*— της επιστρυψεως τον τροπον, θειον οντα ως αληθως, κ᾽ αναγκαιοτατον ημιν.

[y] Propterea per modum occultationis qui est vere divinus, et maxime nobis necessarius in adyto veritatis repositum verbum revera sacrum, Ægyptii quidem per ea quæ apud ipsos vocantur *adyta*, Hebræi autem *per velum* significabant: quæ adire solis licebat, qui erant ex ipsis consecrati, hoc est, deo dedicati, quibus erant circumcisæ vitiorum cupiditates, per suam in solum Deum charitatem. Non mundo enim mundum tangere Platoni quoque vide-

 batur

The Doctor ſays, Clemens is not to be blamed for the unfavourable deſcription which he gives of the Myſteries. The advocate for this inſtitution will ſay, he is not to be blamed for the eulogium which he beſtows upon them, when he repreſents them as the grand depoſitary of the moſt ſacred and religious truths [z]. Which is in the right, muſt be ſubmitted to

batur eſſe nefarium. Hinc prophetiæ et reſponſa dantur per ænigmata. Nec oſtenduntur Myſteria iis qui temere accedunt, ſed cum quibuſdam expiationibus et prædictionibus. p. 555.

[z] It was but natural for him to ſpeak thus highly and magnificently of the Pagan Myſteries, ſince he himſelf introduced, or, at leaſt, encouraged the introduction of, the ſame ſort of diſcipline into the Chriſtian church. For he pretended to be intruſted with certain ſacred and ſublime doctrines, which were to be communicated only *to the few*, and not laid before *the body of the faithful*. *Odi profanum vulgus et arceo*, was the honeſt Chriſtian theology of thoſe times.

Some of them carried their extravagance ſo far that they would not commit their myſtical and arcane doctrines *to writing*, leſt they ſhould by this means come to the knowledge of the common Chriſtians, or the *uninitiated* and *profane vulgar*. Thus Origen ſpeaks of certain Myſteries *chartis non committenda* in Epiſ. ad Rom. c. 2.

Clemens juſtifies this method of teaching by the example and authority of the Pagan Myſteries, and *the double doctrine* of the philoſophers.

But to diſſipate and remove all doubts with regard to the propriety and rectitude of the practice, he takes upon him to aſſign it a much higher and nobler origin. For he very frankly and roundly declares, that our bleſſed Saviour had a ſyſtem of *private* and *arcane* principles, which he communicated after his reſurrection, to only two or three of his apoſtles. They taught it to the reſt, and then it was communicated to the ſeventy *. This ſacred depoſitum was not, it ſeems, to be entruſted to *writing*, as it would have been diſhonoured and debaſed by being put on the ſame foot with the *vulgar* and *common* doctrines delivered

* Strom. p. 322.

in

to the judgment of the public. In the mean time it may be worth obſerving, that when he ſpeaks for them, he is ſeconded by the concurrent teſtimony of the ableſt and wiſeſt Pagans. When he ſpeaks againſt them, he is contradicted not only by the teſtimony of the ableſt and wiſeſt Pagans, but even by his own.

It may, perhaps, be thought Clemens was guilty of no contradiction in the accounts which he gives of the Myſteries. In the time he wrote, they were in ſuch a ſtate and condition, as afforded a handle to ſay much good or much ill of them, as a zealous advocate for Chriſtianity was diſpoſed, either for the gratification of his humour, or the ſupport of his argument, to repreſent them. The Author of the Divine Legation has ſhewn how early and how eaſily ſome of them became corrupt. When Clemens regarded the Myſteries in a light injurious to Chriſtianity, as when they pretended to luſtrate, and purify, and regenerate the participants, he then took the advantage of the *corrupted* Myſteries, and

in the books of the New Teſtament. But though the poſſeſſors of it were cautious of making it too cheap by revealing it promiſcuouſly to the *whole flock*, yet he gives us to underſtand, that himſelf was one of the choice and ſelect perſons, who were favoured and diſtinguiſhed above their fellows, by being initiated in theſe myſtical and arcane doctrines †. And as he had the honour of being appointed to communicate them to others, he muſt have been one of the *Myſtagogues* and *Hierophants* of the Chriſtian church.

Is not this practice in ſome of the primitive fathers more than a thouſand arguments to ſhew, that in their opinion, and in the general opinion of Paganiſm, very ſublime doctrines were taught in the Myſteries? I ſay, *in the general opinion of Paganiſm.* For this Antichriſtian imitation of the Pagan Myſteries was to make them think the more favourably of the new religion.

† Strom. p. 323, 324. 327.

called

called the participants Atheists. When he wanted to do credit to the Christian doctrine of the Unity amongst the Pagans, he then has recourse to the *pure* and *incorrupt* Mysteries, and represents them as teaching *this* amongst the other sacred and sublime doctrines of the Pagan theology. The Bishop has shewn, that Virgil and Apuleius have drawn a picture both of the pure and debauched Mysteries. The one are recommended to the veneration of their readers, the other are exposed to their abhorrence.

It is of no consequence to my present argument, whether we admit this solution, or hold that Clemens was all along speaking of the same Mysteries, and so chargeable with contradiction and inconsistency. For on the last supposition I need only ask, Whether his testimony is more credible when opposed to, or when confirmed by, the concurrent evidence of the best and wisest Pagans?

Our learned Author quotes Eusebius, as giving the same odious and detestable character of the Mysteries with Clemens. But Eusebius only quotes from Clemens, and only quotes with the Doctor the place in which he represents them as a diabolical institution, fraught with the most execrable impiety and atheism. Both Eusebius and the Doctor might have produced the passages, in which he speaks of them as replete with the most sacred and venerable truths, or the best and soundest parts of the religion of the wisest and most enlightened Pagans. But then, what use could they have made of his Authority in the present argument?

After all, How can the Doctor require us to believe, on the affirmation of Eusebius, that neither the institutors, nor conductors, of the Mysteries, *knew any thing of the one true God?* Eusebius

himſelf tells us, *that the Myſtagogue was clothed in the habit of the Creator* [a]. Now was he diſtinguiſhed by this *particular habit*, that he might ſcatter his impiety and atheiſm with more decorum and propriety? Or was it poſſible he ſhould have been *thus* diſtinguiſhed, if neither the inſtitutors, nor conductors of the Myſteries, *had known any thing of the one true God?*

Again, he has preſerved a fragment of Philo Byblius, which informs us, that the ſerpent was made an emblem or repreſentative of the one ſupreme God, and, *as ſuch*, often uſed in the Myſteries [b]. And would the Doctor have us reject, on the authority of Euſebius, two facts, which are thus expreſsly vouched and atteſted by Euſebius himſelf? Would he have us believe, on the teſtimony of Euſebius, that the conductors of the Myſteries *knew nothing* of the Unity, when Euſebius himſelf aſſures us, that *Epcis*, one of the *Hierophants* or *Myſtagogues*, taught this very doctrine?

I ſhall now hazard an obſervation or two on a little poem, going under the name of Orpheus, which the Biſhop ſuppoſes to have been the very hymn ſung in the greater Myſteries. It runs thus: "I will declare a SECRET to the initiated; but let "the doors be ſhut againſt the profane. But "thou, O Muſæus, the offſpring of the bright Se-"lene, attend carefully to my ſong, for I ſhall "deliver the truth without diſguiſe. Suffer not, "therefore, thy former prejudices, to debar thee "of that happy life, which the knowledge of theſe "ſublime truths will procure unto thee: but care-"fully contemplate this divine oracle, and preſerve "it in purity of mind and heart. Go on in the

[a] Præp. Evang. l. 3, 12. εν δε τοις κατ' Ελευσινα μυστηριοις ο μεν ιεροφαντης εις εικονα τυ δημιουργου ενσκευαξεται.

[b] Vide p. 33.

"right

"right way, and *see the sole Governor of the world:* "*he is one, and of himself alone; and to that one all* "*things owe their being. He operates through all,* "*was never seen by mortal eyes, but does himself see* "*every one* [c]."

The Bishop does not bring this poem, as some would insinuate, to shew that the Mysteries teach the Unity. Having previously proved the affirmative by very clear and solid arguments, he offers this as the hymn in which they taught it.

Clemens Alexandrinus ushers it in with the following words: "But the Thracian mystagogue, "who was at the same time a poet, Orpheus, the "son of Oeager, *after he had opened the Mysteries*, and sung the whole theology of idols [d], "offering a recantation of what he had before said, "introduceth the truth, and delivers, though late, "*the truly sacred discourse*," i. e. the hymn abovementioned [e].

He speaks of an ancient poem, in which Orpheus, "*After he had opened the Mysteries*, and sung

[c] Vide Divine Legation, p. 177.

"The Orphic verses, says Dr. Leland, whether com-"posed by Orpheus himself or not, give, in many in-"stances, *a just representation of the ancient pagan theology.*" vol. i. p. 102. Supposing then the poem above quoted was not the hymn sung in the Mysteries, yet it will furnish a strong presumption, that the Unity was taught there. For it represents this as *a private and arcane doctrine, which was to be with-held from the* ἐεδηλοι, i. e. *the uninitiated.*

φθεγξομαι οις θεμις εστι, θυρας δ' επιθισθε εεδηλοι.

[d] To understand the force of this passage, we are to know, that the Mystagogue explained the representations in the Mysteries; where, as we learn from Apuleius, the supernal and infernal Gods passed in review. To each of these they sung an hymn, which Clemens calls *the theology of Images*, or *Idols* These are yet to be seen amongst the works *ascribed* to Orpheus.

[e] Divine Legation, 179. Clem. Admon. 48.

"many

"many hymns in honour of the vulgar deities, *recanted all he had before said*, by teaching the Unity." It should seem then, that the hymn teaching the Unity, was as much a part of the Mysteries, as those celebrating *the theology of idols*, or sung in honour of the popular Divinities. The only difference is, the one preceded in the lesser, the other followed in the greater Mysteries.

It begins with the formula used by the mystagogue on that occasion, *warning the profane to keep at distance*; and in the fourth line, mentions that *new life* or *regeneration*, to which the initiated were taught to aspire [f].

It contained a palinodia or recantation of the popular theology. And we know from the history of Diagoras, that the Orphic hymns sung in the Mysteries, contained a palinodia or recantation of this system [g].

Each of the hymns in the lesser Mysteries, celebrating the honour of the idols or false Gods, was called Ιερος λογος. In opposition to these, Clemens styles this ιερος οντως λογος, or *the truly sacred discourse*. In another place, speaking of the discourse which inculcated the grand arcanum of the Mysteries, he calls it ιερος ατεχνως λογος [h].

When in the humour to speak favourably of the Mysteries, he speaks of them as teaching *the same doctrine of the Unity*, with the hymn we are here considering [i].

[f] Φθεγξομαι οις θεμις, θυρας δ' επιθεσθε βεβηλοι
μηδε σι τα περιν
εν γαθεσσι φανεντα φιλης αιωνος αμερσω.

[g] We have shewn above that Diagoras was proscribed for divulging the Orphic hymn sung in the Mysteries.

[h] δια τουτο τοι της επικρυψεως τον τροπον, θειον οντα ως αληθως κ) αναγκαιοτατον ημιν, εν τω αδυτω της αληθειας αποκειμενον, ΙΕΡΟΝ ΑΤΕΧΝΩΣ ΛΟΓΟΝ, Αιγυπτιοι μεν δια των παρ' αυτοις αδυτων καλουμενων, Εβραιοι δε δια του παραπετασματος ηνιξαντο.

[i] p. 582.

It is, after all, of no importance to his Lordship's main syſtem concerning the Myſteries, whether he be right or wrong in his conjecture on this poem. However, a few ſtrictures on what the Doctor has alledged in oppoſition to it, may not be unſeaſonable.

Clemens obſerves, that it came *late*. "But this, "ſays the Doctor, could not be, if the ſong made "part of the Myſteries, and was ſung by the hiero-"phant himſelf, at the time of the celebration. "For then it muſt have been ſung in the pro-"per ſeaſon, according to the order and courſe "of the Myſteries [k]."

Notwithſtanding it was ſung at the very time which *the order and courſe of the Myſteries required*, it might be ſaid to come *late*. For it did not commence till the opening of the *greater* Myſteries. It was then of no advantage to *the main body* of the initiated, who had been diſmiſſed with all their ancient prejudices full blown upon them, or under the ſtrongeſt impreſſions in favour of popular theology.

Again, "If Clemens, ſays he, had believed this "hymn to have been a part of the Myſteries, he "would not, as he does in a paſſage to be produced "afterwards, have called thoſe Myſteries, *the Myſ-"teries of Atheiſts*, or ſay, of thoſe who celebrated "and conducted them, that they *do not acknowledge "him who* is truly and really God [l]."

He ſhould have reflected, that he has to do with a Writer, who ſometimes ſpeaks of the Myſteries, as the ſchool of impiety and irreligion, and alſo often repreſents them as the true repoſitory of all ſacred and divine knowledge; more particularly as explaining *the firſt intelligence*, or the Unity of the

[k] p. 226, 227.
[l] p. 226.

Godhead.

Godhead. How extravagant then is it to affirm, that he could never declare them the repositories of the Unity, and all sacred and religious truth, because he had called them the Mysteries of the Atheists, or the school of impiety and irreligion? I might as well say, he could never call them the Mysteries of the Atheists, or the school of impiety and irreligion, because he has often declared them the repositories of all sacred and religious truth.

The learned Gentleman seems to have deceived himself by supposing, that Clemens must always have spoke of the Mysteries, in the same constant, uniform, and unvaried manner.

But "If this hymn, says the Doctor, related to "the most sacred part of the hidden doctrine of "the Mysteries, and was communicated only to a "few of the initiated, under the most tremendous "seal of secrecy, it is hard to conceive, how it "should come to be openly published to the world, "so that the Jews and Christians should know it [m]."

Now he himself assures us, that many of the first Christians, *initiated* before their conversion, were well acquainted with the arcana of the Mysteries, and knew all that was revealed in them [n].

The assuming sometimes that they could not possibly know, and at other times that they could not

[m] vol. i. p. 228.

[n] "It may be reasonably supposed, that considering the "great number of persons, which were converted from "Heathenism to Christianity, in the first ages of the Christian church, many of whom were of considerable parts "and learning, *there were not a few*, who had been admitted both to the lesser and the greater Mysteries, and were "therefore well acquainted with the nature and design of "them. And though, whilst they continued Pagans, they "might have thought themselves obliged not to reveal the "secret doctrines which had been taught in the Mysteries, "yet, upon their embracing Christianity, they would not "have looked upon themselves to be any longer under engagements to keep the secret." p. 244.

430955

but know, these arcana, just as the various purpose of his argument may require; is going greater lengths than would be allowed to any other writer.

Again; he contends that *the theology of idols*, or the idolatrous theology, mentioned by Clemens, was *the whole* theology of the Mysteries. If so, Clemens must have been very conversant in the Orphic poems, which contained *the whole theology*, or ALL *the private and arcane doctrines*, that were revealed to the initiated.

He will give me leave to add, that the fathers were in possession of the writings of Melanthius, Menander, Hicesius, Sotades, who all wrote expresly on the Mysteries [o].

The arcana of the Mysteries were the less likely to escape them, as they were perfectly acquainted with what had passed between Alexander and the Egyptian hierophant on this subject. For it is to them we are indebted for this curious anecdote. They knew that Diagoras had been proscribed for publishing the Orphic hymn sung in the Mysteries. And it is no improbable supposition, that they had the very writings in which he published this hymn [p].

All the Fathers, to whom the history and writings of Numenius were known, must have had an easy access to this secret. For he is said to have violated and prostituted the dignity of the Mysteries, by unveiling and laying them naked before the uninitiated and profane [q].

The

[o] Vide Meursius de Eleusiniis and Divine Legation.

It appears from Porphyry, that *many* ancient authors had published accounts of the Mysteries of *Mithras:* for he speaks of Pallas, as being the best and ablest of *all the writers on this subject*. De Abs. 2. 56.

[p] Vide part i. p. 29.

[q] Numenio inter philosophos occultorum curiosiori offensam numinam, *quod Eleusinia sacra interpretando vulgaverit*,

The Doctor makes it matter of great importance, "that many learned persons, both ancient and "modern, have been of opinion, that we have no "verses of Orpheus remaining, which can be de-"pended upon as his [r]." But why this to the Author of Divine Legation? Has he engaged to be sponsor for the genuineness and authenticity of the Orphic verses? Does he not speak of them as compositions *ascribed to, and going under the name of* Orpheus?

As for the hymn in question, he will readily own, that it was found among the compositions of the spurious Orpheus. All he contends for is, that it was the hymn sung in the Mysteries.——It bears the plainest marks and signatures of this hymn, and may be conceived to have come among the compositions just recited in the following manner. An impostor writes and publishes hymns in the name of Orpheus. Now Orpheus was the mystagogue in these secret rites. How then could he possibly carry on the cheat more effectually, than to give the hymn sung in the Mysteries, which (he being initiated in the greater Mysteries) we must suppose him possessed of, under the venerable name of Orpheus [s]?

The

verit, somnia prodiderunt, &c. Macrobius in Somn. Scipionis, l. 1, 2.

Meursius, in the 10th chapter de Eleusiniis, speaking of the books, which contained the arcana of the Mysteries, and were read to the aspirants during their celebration, brings the following passage from Galen: Et Mysteriorum libros ausi sunt quidam *non initiatorum* legere.

[r] p. 227, 228.

[s] We may be told, it is not credible that any of the initiated would *publish in their writings* the grand arcanum of the Mysteries. But some of the quotations produced above, particularly that from Jamblichus, p 46. shew, that the initiated

The Doctor ſays, "This hymn is given more "at large by Clemens in his Stromata, and at ſtill "greater length by Euſebius [t]." And ſome of the additional verſes ſeem to point at *Moſes* and *Abraham*. But if ſo, how is it poſſible that it ſhould have been the hymn ſung in the Myſteries? To this I reply, It is allowed on all hands, that the poems of the *ſpurious* Orpheus have been *interpolated*, and that the verſes pointing at *Moſes* and *Abraham* were *an interpolation*, will admit of no doubt [u].

initiated ſometimes really did do what the objection ſuppoſes they never could do. And as ſuch books were only intended for the uſe of the few, there was not much danger that the ſecret ſhould get air, and come to the knowledge of the people. Accordingly we find, that the ancients were not very cautious and tender of openly delivering in their writings thoſe doctrines, which they were moſt ſtudious to hide and conceal from the vulgar.

The preſent poem will be a very pregnant proof of this, notwithſtanding we ſhould allow it was not the hymn ſung in the Myſteries. For it profeſſes to teach a doctrine, *which was to be ſtudiouſly ſecreted from popular and common knowledge.*

It was not then, as now, when a numerous edition of any book may be propagated from the preſs. Manuſcripts were but in few hands, and the liberty of tranſcribing indulged only to ſuch as were deemed capable of keeping the ſecret.

[t] p. 227.

[u] The learned Moſheim, ſpeaking of Cudworth's remarks on this Orphic poem, ſays, Extat, præter alios, apud Euſebium Præparat. Evang. l. 13. c. 12. una cum aliis Orphei verſibus, in quibus et ſequens de Abrahamo extat oraculum. Omnes illi verſus deprompti ſunt, Euſebio auctore, ex Ariſtobuli, Judæi, et philoſophi ſimul peripatetici opere quodam ad Ægypti regem Ptolemæum exarato. Sed hi ipſi verſus apud Juſtinum M. *in cohort. ad Gentes* et *apologia ſecunda* aliter multo ſeſe habent, neque paucis eorum, qui apud Euſebium offenduntur, carent; *in quibus et hi de Moſe et Abrahamo verſus ſunt*, quos fruſtra in illo, ut a Juſtino exhibetur, fragmento quæſiveris Orphei. *Quare perſpicuum eſt, fuiſſe vel Chriſtianorum vel Judæorum aliquem, qui priſcos Orphei verſus ex ſuo ingenio interpolaverit.* Moſheim's Cudworth, vol. i. p. 34. n 37.

Well;

Well; but *the very poem quoted by the Bishop*, has been arraigned and treated as the forgery of some *Christian*. It could not therefore be the hymn sung in the Mysteries. The charge of forgery has been raised on the 5th verse;

Εις δε λογον θειον βλεψας, τουτῳ προσεδρευε.

Justin Martyr, if the *Cohortatio* be his, supposes that θειος λογος means *the Son of God*, and Langus translates these words by *verbum divinum*. Hence Cudworth seems to have inferred, that this poem must have been the composition of some *Christian* [y]. But Vigerus, by his more just and accurate translation (divina oracula) shews this inference to be visionary and groundless [z].

It would be pleasant enough to find the terms θειος λογος offered as a proof, that this could not be the hymn sung in the Mysteries. For where is the difference between θειος and ιερος λογος? Now we know, that the hymns sung in the Mysteries were denominated ιεροι λογοι.

Clemens, in the passage above quoted, says, "Orpheus, the Thracian mystagogue, opened the "Mysteries, *celebrated the theology of the idols*, or "sung hymns in honour of the national Gods, and "then retracted and unsaid all he had before "taught, by delivering the poem in question."

As the Doctor mantains, that this poem was no part of the Mysteries, but a palinodia or recantation of the religious principles inforced in them, he lays himself under the necessity of holding, that

[y] Intellectual System, p. 301.

[z] Mosheim says, Mihi vigerus recte sententiam perspexisse videtur Orphei, qui ejusmodi personæ, qualis est sanctissimum Dei verbum, hic minime meminit. *Quo circa nec opus est, ut Christianum aliquem hanc versum Orpheo suppposuisse existimemus.* Dicamus potius Justinum contra mentem Orphei Christianæ disciplinæ semina in eo quæsivisse. p. 348. n. 39.

the theology of idols, or the idolatrous theology, was *the whole theology* of the Mysteries, and consequently, that they had nothing to do with the more sublime and venerable doctrines of paganism [y].

He set out indeed with advancing this strange paradox, or affirming the original design of the Mysteries was "to bring men to a greater awe and veneration for the laws and *religion of their coun-*

[y] The doctor holds, that Clemens all along speaks of *the same* Mysteries, and is *consistent* in the account which he gives of them. Let him then vindicate his *consistency* on the supposition that he here represents them as teaching only the vulgar and fabulous theology.

In one place he declares, that they were open to none but *men of superior rank, education, merit, and learning*. But surely no extraordinary share of these accomplishments could be deemed necessary to qualify them for the knowledge of the vulgar and fabulous theology, or a heap of despicable trash, which was every day freely communicated to the meanest, lowest, and most worthless of the people.

He says the Mysteries were a sage and excellent provision, "well adapted to the blindness and infirmity of human nature, which render the generality of men unable to bear the truth." Now the generality of men could hardly be thought incapable of bearing the popular theology, which was invented for their use, and purposely let down and accommodated to the grossness of their understandings and prejudices.

He tells us, "that the participants had the same advantage over the uninitiated, with regard to religious knowledge, which the high-priest, by his access to *the holy of holies*, had over the vulgar Jews." How is this consistent with the supposition, that the aspirants were instructed in nothing more than the common and popular theology?

In his *admonition*, he loads with the most bitter execrations those who imported the Mysteries out of Egypt into Greece. He charges all who conducted and partook of them with impiety and atheism. But, in the same treatise, he observes, that Orpheus, who brought the Mysteries out of Egypt into Greece, was one of the mystagogues and conductors of them; and he speaks of him at the same time as teaching the Unity, and detecting the falshood of the vulgar idolatry.

"*try*".[1] This was a very partial and inadequate representation, when he was speaking of the Mysteries *in general*; the *greater* as well as the *lesser*. There is no room to believe the *first* were calculated to imprint a deeper awe and veneration for *the publick worship*.

They opened the human original of the greater Gods to the more *sensible* and *judicious* part of the aspirants. And were persons of *this character* likely to entertain a greater awe and veneration for them, or to think *more highly* of their *divinity*, on being informed that they were men, and sometimes the worst and most detestable of men? For some of them had been the opprobrium of humanity; *thieves*, *vagabonds*, *murderers*, *adulterers*, *pathics*, or all which it was possible for the basest and vilest of men to be.

If the Mysteries inspired a greater reverence for the national religion, How could Diagoras's divulging the secret of the first, expose the honour and credit of the last? How could his publishing the Orphic hymn, used in the Mysteries, bring him under the imputation of ridiculing the public religion, if all the hymns sung on the occasion celebrated *the theology of idols*, or the praises of the popular Gods?

If the greater Mysteries looked with so favourable an aspect on the public religion, What had the Egyptian hierophant to fear from the promulgation of the secret? Or, How could Varro have said they were instituted for the conveyance of CERTAIN TRUTHS, *which it was not expedient the people should know*[2]?

Chrysippus and Clemens agree in affirming, that the Mysteries taught the *arcane* and *recondite* theo-

[1] p. 206.

[2] Multa esse vera, quæ vulgo scire non sit utile; multaque quæ, tametsi falsa sint, *aliter existimare populum expediat*. Et ideo Græcos *Teletas* ac *Mysteria* taciturnitate parietibusque inclusisse. Aug. de C. D. l. 4. 31.

logy, or the ſelect ſyſtem of ſacred and divine truths, which was hid from the vulgar Pagans. Strabo and Galen acquaint us, that they opened and explained the *philoſophical* notions of the Divinity. But will any one ſay, that the ſyſtem of *arcane* and *reconditu* theology, or the *philoſophical* notions of the Divinity, would attach its votaries more cloſely to the national religion?

Thus I have taken the liberty to examine the two propoſitions advanced by this celebrated Writer: 1. That the Myſteries did not detect the error of the vulgar polytheiſm. 2. That they did not teach the Unity. How far the evidence I have offered may be ſufficient to invalidate both, or either of theſe aſſertions, muſt be ſubmitted to the judgment of others. As for myſelf, I ſhall, at leaſt, have the pleaſure and ſatisfaction of affording the learned perſon an opportunity of adding new light and ſtrength to his hypotheſis, by clearing up and diſcharging ſome objections, which ſeem to bear hard againſt it.

FINIS.

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND THE

Lord Bishop of GLOUCESTER;

IN WHICH

The *Divine Legation* of MOSES

IS VINDICATED,

As well from the

MISAPPREHENSIONS of his Lordship's FRIENDS;

AS THE

MISREPRESENTATIONS of his ENEMIES:

And in which

His LORDSHIP'S MERITS as a WRITER

Are clearly proved

To be far superior to the ENCOMIUMS

OF HIS

WARMEST ADMIRERS.

Samuel Cooper

Hi motus Animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta,
Pulveris exigui jactu, compressa quiescunt.

VIRG.

LONDON,

Printed for W. NICOLL, at the Paper-Mill, in St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCLXVII.

[Price One Shilling.]

To the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of GLOUCESTER,

Qui Genus Humanum superavit.

MY LORD,

YOUR Lordship's great Reputation as a sincere and unprejudiced Enquirer into Truth, and amiable Character for Candour as well as Learning, embolden me to think, that you will pardon the Freedom of this Address; though it comes from one who is entirely unknown to your Lordship, and who intends at present to be unknown to the Publick. Think not, however, my Lord, that this proceeds from any Fear, lest my present Undertaking should diminish any Part of that Fame I may have acquired by former Publications. No, my Lord, had I not thought that this Letter would do Credit to its Author, it would never have been presented to the Publick, as it would, in that Case, fail of the *End* aimed at, viz. the Increase and Diffusion of your

Lordſhip's Fame, to which my Reputation muſt be the *Means*. But as the Envy and Malice of the World are always attributing the *worſt* Motives to the *beſt* Actions, and as my Situation in the Church is ſuch, that though it may excite Envy in others, yet it may be thought not to have ſubdued all Ambition in me, were I to affix my Name to this Performance, this Addreſs might be attributed to a Deſire of your Lordſhip's Patronage, not to the real Motive, a profound Veneration for your Lordſhip's great Abilities. Whereas my true Reaſon for concealing myſelf is, leſt your Lordſhip, out of your great Goodneſs, Condeſcenſion, and Generoſity, ſhould force me from that Lot, in which I am contented, to Stations of greater Dignity and Power, which I do not like.

You may think, perhaps, my Lord, that I am one amongſt the many of whom your Lordſhip has made ſuch honourable Mention in ſome of your illuſtrious Notes to ſome of your illuſtrious Publications; and, therefore, what I am now doing, is only what I am bound in Gratitude to perform. No, my Lord, I glory in my Diſintereſtedneſs; and I am not the leaſt aſhamed to confeſs, that I am one amongſt the very few Writers of this Century, who cannot boaſt of an Obligation of this or any other kind from the Biſhop of *Glouceſter*.

Truth,

Truth, an enthuſiaſtick Love of Truth, is the ruling Paſſion of my Breaſt, and as nothing can more obſtruct its Progreſs, than the miſunderſtanding of your Lordſhip's Works, it is the *Akme* of my Ambition to rectify, in this Reſpect, the Miſtake of the World. A Miſtake which I have long beheld with Impatience; as I am perſuaded, Truth can never prevail, till the profoundeſt Reverence and the moſt implicit Submiſſion be paid to your Learning and Genius, and your Lordſhip be univerſally acknowledged as the ſovereign and infallible Pontiff in the World of Letters, which has been by ſome abſurdly called a *Republic*. But how much Honour does it reflect on your Lordſhip, what a noble Contempt of Fame does it ſhow, (which Quality has, indeed, ever diſtinguiſhed you, and given you a Place far above all the Philoſophers of *Greece* and *Rome*,) that your Lordſhip has beheld all the Miſrepreſentations of your Works, both by your Friends and Enemies, with the utmoſt Calmneſs, and the cooleſt Indifference, notwithſtanding the many Opportunities for Revenge your Lordſhip has had, both as an Author and an Editor. Contempt or Reſentment, which would have taken Poſſeſſion of the Breaſt of almoſt any other Mortal, never entered nor diſcompoſed your Boſom. Acrimony, and even Abuſe, which would have found their Way into the Writ-

ings of almoſt any other Man, never ſtained your Page. But why ſhould I mention what all the World knows, that Patience, Meekneſs, Philanthropy, all the Tenderneſſes of Humanity, and all the amiable Virtues of Chriſtianity, are the characteriſtick Marks of your Lordſhip's Writings? But, though your Lordſhip can be thus unſollicitous about your own Fame, I cannot. The World has been long enough immerſed in Folly, it is time for it now to begin to learn Wiſdom.

Though numberleſs are the low and abuſive Pamphlets which have been written againſt your Lordſhip, *that* lately publiſhed by the preſent Biſhop of *Oxford* was never equalled in theſe Reſpects; and (if I may be allowed the Expreſſion) was ſuperior to all for its total Deficiency in Wit and Argument. A Pamphlet which your Lordſhip, with the greateſt Truth, affirmed, "You never *did*, "and that you believe you never *ſhall* read;" but which, to give a Proof of your unprecedented Candour and Humility, you condeſcended to anſwer *. That Writer hints a Deſign of attacking the whole *Divine Legation*. He ſpeaks, indeed, dubiouſly, as if he were not fully determined to put it into Execution. But as it is evident he is amongſt the Number of thoſe who groſſly miſunderſtand your Lordſhip, I am reſolved,

* See *Monthly Review*, for *May*, 1766.

by

by pointing out his Miſtake, and by developing the true Meaning, End, and Deſign of the *Divine Legation*, to ſave him the Trouble. And I ſhall leave him to exerciſe his Pen upon Works far leſs ſublime, and better ſuited to his groveling Genius and contracted Learning.

But, my Lord, I muſt rely on your Lordſhip's *Good-nature* for Pardon, on account of the Pain your Modeſty will make you feel, whilſt I am informing the World what appears to me to have been your real Motive for writing that great Work, and explain all the dark *Hieroglyphics* in that Performance. A Work, which, in the Light in which I ſhall place it, will add new Luſtre to your Lordſhip's Fame, and make it eclipſe the Brightneſs of every other Writer, antient or modern. Of all Men, I would not appear vain to your Lordſhip; "ſince of all Men you "beſt know how ill it would become my "Pride *." But as I have the utmoſt Reaſon to believe that your Lordſhip never *initiated* any one into theſe *Myſteries*, my Ability to dive into them will, I hope, give you a high Opinion of the Profundity of my Genius. And as your Lordſhip is the great Diſpenſer of modern Reputation, pardon my Preſumption, if I hope, that you will allow me to be claſſed in the Temple of Fame, next even to the celebrated Diſco-

* Ded. to Lord *Mansfield*, Ed. 3d.

verer

verer of the *Eleusinian Mysteries* in the sixth Book of the *Æneid.*

"To live in the Voice and Memory of "Men is the flattering Dream of every Ad-"venturer in Letters; and for me, who boast "the rare Felicity of being honoured with "the Friendship of two or three superior "Characters, Men endowed with Virtue to "atone for a bad Age, and of Abilities to "make a bad Age a good one, for *me* not "to aspire to the best Mode of this ideal "Existence, the being carried down to re-"mote Ages along with those who will never "die, would be a strange Insensibility to hu-"man Glory*."

Inspired, therefore, by the Love of Truth, and incited likewise by the Hope of immortal Fame, I shall, without further Preface, proceed to the Discovery of your Lordship's secret Intentions in your *Divine Legation.*

That your Lordship is thoroughly versed in all the Learning of the Antients, not only in what they *did* write, but likewise in what they did *not* write, every one must know who has read your learned Dissertation on *Hieroglyphics.* That your Lordship is likewise conversant in every modern Production of *Europe,* from the most abstruse Work of Philosophy to the lowest Romance, no one, in the least acquainted with your Lordship's

* Ded. to Lord *Mansfield.*

Works,

Works, can poſſibly doubt *. That your Lordſhip is perfectly ſenſible the preſent State of Learning in *Europe* is ſo low, that the beſt Works are only read by a few, and even by thoſe few ſoon forgotten, your *Divine Legation* alone would afford us many Proofs. For as your Lordſhip has yourſelf diſclaimed all Right in Paradoxes, the many contained in that great Work can only be borrowed from other valuable Works, little known and leſs read. Laſtly; who that is converſant in your Lordſhip's *Polemic* Writings; and which of your Writings are not *Polemic?* can doubt of your confeſſing, that the Principles of Logic, and the Art of Reaſoning, are entirely uncultivated by the preſent Age? Nay, who can doubt that you really think there is no Opinion ſo abſurd in itſelf, or which can be defended by ever ſo weak Arguments, which would not obtain the Approbation of many, eſpecially if uſhered into the World with Confidence, a pretended Love of Truth, and an apparent Concern for the Intereſts of Religion?

From theſe Premiſes, every Reader muſt already begin to conjecture, *what* the Concluſion is, which I am about to deduce, and your Lordſhip muſt already know that it is a true one, viz. That your real, though concealed Deſign, in undertaking the *Divine Legation*, was to try how a Work, con-

* See Preface to *Jarvis's Don Quixote.*

ſtructed

ſtructed on the Principles I have juſt mentioned, would really be received by the World. Not, indeed, by chuſing for a Subject an Opinion falſe in itſelf: but, with much more Art, engaging the publick Attention, by making Choice of a Subject true in itſelf, and generally received. Giving, however, the higheſt Perfection to an Undertaking of this Kind, by endeavouring to prove it through the Medium of a Propoſition in the higheſt Degree repugnant to Reaſon; and by ſuch Arguments as muſt appear, in the greateſt Degree, weak and fallacious to every good Logician, were any ſuch to be found in the World beſides your Lordſhip and myſelf. Your Lordſhip's Performance, therefore, having ſucceeded even beyond Expectation, the Truth of the Experiment upon which it was founded, is eſtabliſhed beyond Controverſy.

For your Lordſhip has ſeen your Work at Home admired by the Many, and patronized by the Great. Abroad, quoted by the Ingenious, and tranſlated by the Learned; whilſt your Lordſhip, enjoying the Fruits of this Admiration and Patronage in one of the higheſt Dignities of the Church, ſat ſmiling at the Encomiums of your Friends, and the Objections of your Enemies. Smiling, my Lord, to think that though your Work has attracted the Attention of all *Europe*, and your Friends and

Enemies

Enemies have for ſeveral Years been waging War on your Account, no one has ever, before me, dived into the real Deſign of that Publication. But they have all, hitherto, miſtaken Irony for Serioufneſs; Commendation for Satire; Sophiſtry for Argument; and Ridicule for Reaſon. The *former* proving themſelves *Fools*, by reaſoning *wrong* from *right* Principles: Concluding, that *becauſe* your Lordſhip cannot *err*, *therefore* the Arguments in the *Divine Legation* muſt be *good* *. The *latter*, according to Mr. *Locke*'s Definition, proving themſelves *Madmen*, by reaſoning *right* from *wrong* Principles. For they, taking for granted that your Lordſhip was ſerious, concluded, that *becauſe* your Book contained *bad Logic*, *therefore* your *Lordſhip was in an Error*.

But in the Light in which I have now placed your Work, which, I am perſuaded, is the only true one, how do your Abilities beam forth with unrivaled Luſtre! What a ſurprizing Ductility of Genius do you exhibit! How almoſt incredible is it, that one of ſuch extenſive Learning ſhould ſo well perform the Part of a Smatterer, and that the ableſt Reaſoner in the World ſhould perſonate ſo naturally the Character of a Sophiſt.

* Sorry I am, that I cannot except out of this Number the truly learned and ingenious Annotator on *The Art of Poetry*, &c. whoſe Miſtake in this Point is the only Impeachment of his critical Abilities.

My Hypothesis, however, will not, I doubt, make its Way in the World without great Difficulty and much Opposition, especially as your Lordship's uncommon Modesty will, I fear, prevent you from giving the World an indisputable Confirmation of its Truth. I shall, therefore, not content myself with only *proposing* it as a reasonable Conjecture, but proceed to prove its Certainty. Not from any of those great, but incidental Positions, whether *Theological*, or *Moral*, or *Civil*, or *Political*, or *Critical*, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. which surround the one great central Proposition, but from the very *fundamental Principles* of your renowned *Cyclopædia*. To which not only your Friends have unanimously assented, but which not even your *Enemies* have called in Question.

Your Lordship's first Syllogism, I think, stands thus:

Whatsoever Religion and Society have not a future State for their *Support*, must be supported by *an extraordinary Providence*.

The *Jewish* Religion and Society had not a future State for their Support:

Therefore the *Jewish* Religion and Society were supported by an extraordinary Providence.

Thus, then, I "*erect my Demonstration**."

* *Div. Leg.* Page 7.

What-

Whatſoever Propoſition and Demonſtration of the Biſhop of *Glouceſter*'s have not Reaſon for their Support, muſt be ſupported by Ridicule.

But the Biſhop of *Glouceſter*'s Propoſitions and Demonſtrations in the *Divine Legation* have not Reaſon for their Support:

Therefore the Biſhop of *Glouceſter*'s Propoſitions and Demonſtrations are ſupported by Ridicule.

Now, my Lord, notwithſtanding "*Man's* "*great Love to Paradox and Syſtem**," I ſhall take for granted, that no Libertine or Unbeliever will have the Effrontery to deny my *Major*. For as to your Lordſhip's Adverſaries, ſuch as a *Lowth*, a *Rutherforth*, a *Sykes*, a *Bott*, a *Peter*, or a *Stebbing*, they are People whoſe Objections are not worthy of Notice. Your Lordſhip having yourſelf, in your Preface to *Pope's* Works, obſerved, with your uſual Modeſty, that that Poet, with his Works, bequeathed you his *Dunces*. But, my Lord, to juſtify myſelf ſtill further in not condeſcending to obviate any Objections your Enemies may urge, permit me to tranſcribe a celebrated Paſſage, from the Preface to your fourth Volume of the *Divine Legation*.

"Who has not ſignalized himſelf againſt "the *Divine Legation?* Bigots, Hutchin-

* *Div. Leg.* Page 8.

" ſonians, Methodiſts, Anſwerers, Free-
" thinkers, and Fanaticks, have, in their
" Turns, been all up in Arms againſt it.
" The Scene was opened by a falſe Zealot,
" and, at preſent, ſeems likely to be cloſed
" by a Behmeniſt. A natural and eaſy
" Progreſs from Folly to Madneſs. It was
" now Time to ſettle my Accounts with
" them. To this End, I applied to a
" learned Perſon, who, in conſideration of
" our Friendſhip, has been prevailed upon
" to undergo the Drudgery of turning over
" this dirty Heap, and marking what he
" imagined would, in the leaſt, deſerve, or
" could juſtify, any Notice: For I would
" not have the Reader conceive ſo miſerably
" of me, as to think I was ever diſpoſed to
" look into them myſelf. He will find, as
" he goes along, both in the Text and
" Notes, what was thought leaſt unworthy
" of an Anſwer. Nor let it give him too
" much Scandal, that, in a Work which I
" have now put into as good a Condition
" for him as I was able, I have revived the
" Memory of the numerous and groſs Ab-
" ſurdities of theſe Writers, Part of whom
" are dead, and the reſt forgotten; for he
" will conſider, that it may prove an uſeful
" Barrier to the Return of the like Follies
" in after Times, againſt more ſucceſsful
" Enquirers into Truth *."

* *Div. Leg.* Page 40. Ed. 3d.

Now,

Now, my Lord, as I ſhould likewiſe be very ſorry *if the Reader ſhould conceive ſo miſerably of me*, as to think *I am diſpoſed to turn over ſo dirty a Heap*, I ſhall not condeſcend to touch it. And, indeed, as your Lordſhip has, with the greateſt Humility, condeſcended, for the Benefit of Poſterity, to fill your Ship with it, which, with its Sails,

"Expanded flies, and gathers all its Fame,"

why ſhould I incumber and pollute my little Bark, which

"attendant ſails,
"Purſues the Triumph, and partakes the Gales?"

I ſhall, therefore, take the *major* Propoſition for granted. But as many "*Bigots amongſt* "*Believers may deny the Minor*," this I ſhall proceed to prove, viz. *That the Biſhop of Glouceſter's Propoſitions and Demonſtrations have not Reaſon for their Support.*

Your Lordſhip's *major* Propoſition may be divided into *two*, as it contains two Subjects, *Religion* and *Society*. I ſhall conſider it firſt as it concerns *Religion*.

But as moſt of our Errors proceed from a Want of Definitions, I ſhall begin with defining the principal Words in the Syllogiſm. For it may juſtly be expected, that when ſo able a Reaſoner as your Lordſhip *mean* to err, that you will hide your Intention where others moſt frequently err *undeſignedly*.

The

The Word Religion implies the Discharge of Man's Duty to God, or Obedience to his Laws. But as Man must have some Motive to engage him to the Performance of every Action, and as none can induce *him* to pay Obedience to any Law except the Hope of Reward or the Fear of Punishment, the Practice of Religion must be founded on the Expectation of God's Infliction of Punishments, or his bestowing of Rewards. The Place in which these Punishments and Rewards are expected to be conferred must be either *this* World or the *next*. The Expectation of them in the *former* must be founded in the Doctrine of a *Providence:* In the *latter*, on the Notion of a *future State*. A Thing is said to be the *Support* of another, when it is the Cause of its *Preservation*, or *Continuance* in Being.

From the foregoing Definitions, then, it necessarily follows; that as the Practice of Religion must be founded on the Expectation, either of *present* or *future* Rewards and Punishments; and as these Expectations are built either on the Belief of the Doctrines of a *Providence* or of a *future State*; Religion may be *supported*, or *exist*, on the Belief of *either* of these Doctrines. Consequently likewise, that wheresoever Religion is *not* supported by a Belief in *one* of them, it *must* be supported by Faith in the *other*.

The

The Providence of God is generally divided into *two* Kinds: *ordinary* and *extraordinary*. The *former*, as it respects Religion, signifies the Care the Deity has taken to reward the Good, and to punish the Wicked, by that Series of Events, which he has established in the common Course of Nature. The *latter* may imply the Care of the Deity in bestowing greater Rewards on the Good, and Punishments on the Wicked, by Events *contrary* to the Course of Nature. Or the extraordinary Providence of God, in the Preservation of Religion, may likewise consist, in giving Men Manifestations of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

But as it is evident, that all Religion must be founded either on the Belief of present or future Rewards and Punishments, all the miraculous Interpositions of Deity, or the Agency of an extraordinary Providence, must ultimately tend to the Confirmation of Men's Faith in one or both of these Doctrines.

If it be objected, "that Religion cannot "be supported on the Belief of *present* Re-"wards and Punishments resulting from "the ordinary Providence of God, because "it is pretended, that Experience shows "the Good are sometimes unsuccessful and "the Bad prosperous;" I answer, first, that taking this Objection according to the *strict* Meaning

Meaning of the Words, it does not in the leaſt impugn my Poſition. For Men may be *ſucceſsful* and yet *miſerable*, *unſucceſsful* and yet *contented*. But if it be meant, that the Good are ſometimes *unhappy* and the *Wicked* are *ſometimes happy*, then, ſo far is it from deſtroying, that it eſtabliſhes the *Truth* of my *Poſition* in *general*. And however the *All*-ſufficiency of Virtue to Happineſs may be denied by ſome, yet it muſt be evident to all, that Virtue encreaſes and Vice diminiſhes a Man's Happineſs in every Situation of Life. Which Belief is ſufficient for the Support or mere Exiſtence of Religion. Secondly, Hiſtory evinces, that the Belief of Rewards and Puniſhments in this Life always has, and Experience evinces that it does now, make ſo conſiderable a Part of the Well-being of Religion, that it would *alone* ſupport its Being.

That the Religion will have a *ſtronger* Support which is founded likewiſe on the Expectation of *future* as well as *preſent Rewards and Puniſhments*, is certain. That future Rewards and Puniſhments, therefore, may be proved neceſſary to the *Well*-being, if by that be meant the better Being of a Religion, is evident. But in the ſame Manner may the Belief of *preſent* Rewards and Puniſhments be proved neceſſary to the better Being of a Religion, which has the

Belief

Belief of *future* Rewards and Punishments for its Support.

From these Premises it will appear demonstratively certain, that so able a Reasoner as the Bishop of *Gloucester*, could never seriously intend to deduce the *Divine Legation* of *Moses* through this Medium, his omitting to inculcate the Doctrine of a Future State. For such an Attempt would be totally inconsistent with Reason. As, first, in respect to your Lordship's *major* Proposition. It is so far from being true, "That whatsoever Religion has not a *Future State* for its Support, must be supported by an *extraordinary* Providence;" that it follows, from the foregoing Reasoning, a Religion which is not supported by a Future State, may be supported by a Belief in the *ordinary* Method of God's *Providence*. Your Lordship's Syllogism, therefore, should have stood thus:

A Religion may be supported either on the Belief of a Future State; or, secondly, on the Belief of the *ordinary*; or, thirdly, on the *extraordinary* Method of God's Providence, in distributing Rewards and Punishments in this World.

But the *Jewish* Religion had not the Belief of a Future State for its Support:

Therefore the *Jewish* Religion might be supported either on the Belief of God's ordinary or extraordinary Providence.

Who would not have joined your Lordſhip in a Laugh, had any one *ſeriouſly* propoſed ſuch an Argument in Defence of the *Divine Legation* of *Moſes*? Who then can but admire your Lordſhip's infinite Humour in propoſing it *jocoſely*, and your wonderful Dexterity likewiſe in concealing the Fallacy from View?

If it ſhould be pretended by the *Bigots*, that your Lordſhip did not mean by the Word *Support*, the mere *Being* of a Religion, but its *Well-being*, or moſt perfect Exiſtence, and, by the *extraordinary* Providence of God, only his *ordinary* Providence, as I have explained it above, this will avail them nothing. For the Abſurdity ſtill remaining, the Truth of my Hypotheſis is equally apparent. According to this Interpretation of the Words, it would follow, that "whatſoever Religion is not ſup-"ported by a *Future State*, muſt be ſup-"ported by an *extraordinary* Providence," is ſo far from being a true Propoſition, that *no Religion can be ſupported by the Belief either of a* Future State, *or an* extraordinary Providence, ſingly, *but only by both, conjointly*. Theſe Bigots, therefore, would, by their Interpretation of your Lordſhip's Words, make you the ſerious Author of a ſtill more abſurd Argument than the foregoing. For if their Interpretation be admitted,

mitted, the real Meaning of the Syllogiſm would be this:

No Religion *can* be ſupported, but on the Belief of a Future State and of an extraordinary Providence *conjointly*.

The *Jewiſh* Religion had not the Belief of a Future State for its Support:

Therefore the *Jewiſh* Religion *was* ſupported by the Belief of an extraordinary Providence.

Now this, it muſt be confeſſed, if it had more Art, would be by far the pleaſanteſt Species of ironical Argument: For it directly deſtroys the Poſition it is brought to ſupport. But to ſuppoſe that your Lordſhip could ever ſeriouſly advance ſuch an Argument, would be ſhocking to Reaſon; though your Friends perpetually do it. For how ſucceſsful are they in confirming the Truth of my Hypotheſis, even when they zealouſly endeavour to explode it.

Again, if it be ſaid, that by the Word *Support* the *Well-being* of a Religion is to be underſtood, and the Words, "*Extraordinary Providence*" are to be taken in their ſtrict Senſe, then even granting that a Religion muſt be ſupported by an Extraordinary Providence, which is not ſupported by a Future State, yet, the *Divine Legation* of *Moſes* can never appear from his omitting to inculcate the latter Notion, only

upon this Suppoſition: *That a Religion will be better ſupported by the Belief of an Extraordinary Providence ſingly, than by it and the Belief of a Future State conjointly.* For unleſs *this* be ſuppoſed, nay, unleſs this Suppoſition be true, the omitting to inculcate a Future State would be ſo far from proving *Moſes* to have had a *Divine Legation,* that no other Proof would be wanted of the contrary. According to this Interpretation of the Words, your Lordſhip, on their Hypotheſis, ought to have added the following Syllogiſm:

A Religion is better ſupported on the Belief of an Extraordinary Providence *ſingly,* than on that and a Future State conjointly.

The *Jewiſh* Religion had not a Future State, only an Extraordinary Providence for its Support:

Therefore it was better ſupported, than if it had been ſupported by an Extraordinary Providence and a Future State conjointly.

But, my Lord, if this *was* your Meaning, your Lordſhip's *Omiſſion* of this Syllogiſm could not more ſtrongly evince the Truth of my Hypotheſis, than the *Addition* of it.

Laſtly, Let your Lordſhip's Words be taken in any Senſe they can poſſibly bear, and even granting that a Religion can *not* be ſupported on the Belief only of the Ordi-

Ordinary Providence of God, which I have proved it *can*; it would, by no means, follow, that " whatſoever Religion had not a " Future State for its Support, muſt be " ſupported by an Extraordinary Provi- " dence." For, from the foregoing Reaſoning, it appears, that not the *real Exiſtence* of a Future State, or of an Extraordinary Providence, but only the *Belief* of them, is neceſſary to the Support of Religion. Adding, therefore, to the Conceſſions already made another, in favour of your Lordſhip's Minor, the Syllogiſm could only ſtand thus:

Whatſoever Religion is not ſupported by the Belief of a Future State, muſt be ſupported by the *Belief* of an Extraordinary Providence.

But the *Jewiſh* Religion was not ſupported by the *Belief* of a Future State:

Therefore it was ſupported by the *Belief* of an Extraordinary Providence.

But even then, my Lord, how ſhould we ever arrive, by ſerious Argumentation, at the Concluſion required, " That the *Jews* " were *really* ſupported by an Extraordinary " Providence." To infer that becauſe the *Jews were really* ſupported by an Extraordinary Providence, therefore they *believed* they were, might, indeed, appear tolerably plauſible, did we not know, that though the former was a Fact, yet the latter did not always

always follow from it? But to conclude, that becauſe a People *believed* their Religion was, therefore it was *really* ſupported by an Extraordinary Providence, is an Inference, which, however ſeriouſly it might be deduced by your Friends, would never ſeriouſly be admitted by your Lordſhip. It could be applied by your Lordſhip to no other Purpoſe, than as an ironical Defence of all the Superſtitions in the World, whether founded on the Abſurdities of *Paganiſm*, or grafted on the pure Stock of *Chriſtianity*.

Your Lordſhip and the Publick will, I hope, pardon my Prolixity on the firſt Subject of your major Propoſition, *Religion*, as what is ſaid upon *that*, is equally applicable to the other Subject, *Society*. But the latter is not only liable to the ſame Objections with the former, but it admits likewiſe of one peculiar to itſelf. For though the Belief either of a Providence, or a Future State, is abſolutely neceſſary to the Subſiſtence of *Religion*, they are not to the Being of *Society*. For *that* may exiſt, or be ſupported, merely by human Laws, though not ſo comfortably as if both or either the other Motives were added. And, indeed, it is amazing, that, notwithſtanding, my Lord, your Work has been publiſhed ſo many Years, yet it ſhould *now* be left to me, at this Time, to propoſe my Hypotheſis. For your Lordſhip, knowing how impoſ-

ſible

ſible it was to bring the leaſt Shadow of an Argument to prove the Truth of your major Propoſition, as it reſpects Society, inſtead of ſhowing that the inculcating the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Puniſhments is neceſſary to its *Support*, your Lordſhip, with infinite Humour, only attempts to ſhow that it is neceſſary to its *Well-being*. How aſtoniſhing, therefore! how almoſt incredible is it! that, when your Lordſhip gave your Readers ſo fine an Opening to diſcover the exquiſite Art and Contrivance of your whole Work, that no one before me ſhould ever have perceived it. For granting, that the former Poſition is true, viz. "that the Belief of a Future State is "neceſſary to the *Support* of Society;" yet, as your Lordſhip hath not attempted to prove it, to ſuppoſe that you meant your Work for a ſerious Example of ſolid Reaſoning, would be a Suppoſition in the higheſt Degree incongruous to Reaſon. For your Lordſhip would then have left unproved the very fundamental Principle of your whole Work. And granting, that your Lordſhip *hath* proved the Truth of the latter Poſition, viz. that the Belief of a Future State is neceſſary to the *Well-being* of Society, it would be nothing to the Purpoſe. For this is a Propoſition totally different from *that*, your Lordſhip would, upon that Hypotheſis, have been under a Neceſſity of proving.

Is

Is it not, therefore, a Myſtery totally inexplicable by any Hypotheſis but mine, that your Lordſhip ſhould make one Propoſition the fundamental Principle of your Work, and then amuſe your Readers by an Attempt to prove another? For will any one have the Effrontery to affirm, that a Writer of your Lordſhip's Learning and Abilities could ſeriouſly imagine, that Propoſitions ſo different are the ſame. Or, what is ſtill more ſhocking, that one of your Lordſhip's Candour and Integrity, would ſeriouſly attempt to impoſe one upon the World for the other? Or, laſtly, that one with your Lordſhip's known Diffidence and Modeſty, could ſeriouſly imagine, that *all* the World beſide yourſelf would ignorantly miſtake, and blindly aſſent to, one Propoſition not proved, becauſe your Lordſhip had proved another.

Having given ſuch ample Proof, that the whole of your Lordſhip's Syllogiſm is ſo totally irreconcileable with Reaſon, that even admitting the Truth of the *Minor*, the *Conſequent* does not follow from it: I ſhall not enter into any Scrutiny of the many very ingenious ſophiſtical Arguments by which your Lordſhip endeavours to eſtabliſh that Propoſition. For it is not my Deſign to fatigue your Lordſhip and the Publick, by the Repetition of Arguments which have been

been before advanced, but only to offer ſuch as have occurred to me, and eſcaped others *.

And it muſt be confeſſed, that even your Lordſhip's Enemies have, by ſome Means, blundered into a right Apprehenſion, that your *minor* Propoſition is not founded on Reaſon; though their Intellects were too weak to proceed to the true Concluſion, that your Lordſhip, therefore, was *not ſerious*, but *jocoſe*.

But I cannot forbear to obſerve, (for Juſtice is due even to your Lordſhip's Enemies,) that the ſame Repugnance which *I* have ſhewn between your *Minor* and *Conſequent*, from the Principles of Religion in *general*, *they* have pointed out from a particular Fact relative to the *Jewiſh*. It is an indiſputable Fact, that the *Jews* were not kept in Obedience. How, therefore, they aſk, can it be conſiſtent with the *Divine Legation of Moſes*, that when *preſent* Rewards and Puniſhments failed, he ſhould omit to inculcate the other Motive to Obedience, the Belief of a *future* State, if this had not previouſly obtained amongſt them? To urge that there can be no Doubt that it was right to omit it, becauſe numberleſs Inſtances may be brought to prove *Moſes's*

* For a new Objection to the Minor, ſee *Critical Review*, *Feb.* 1766.

Wiſdom and Goodneſs, would plainly diſcover the Irony of the Reaſoner. For as this one Omiſſion would be a demonſtrative Proof of his Want either of Goodneſs or Wiſdom in the fundamental Principles of Legiſlation, a thouſand other Inſtances of his poſſeſſing theſe Qualities could not deſtroy it. Nay, indeed, every other Inſtance of his Wiſdom or Goodneſs, whether merely as Man, or as being favoured with a Divine Communication, would be a Proof, that he could omit the Doctrine of a Future State, only becauſe it was before generally believed. For what ſhould we think of the Goodneſs of a Phyſician, who had two Preſcriptions; one of which alone would preſerve the Conſtitutions of his Patients in tolerable good Health, but both together, in the moſt perfect Health of which human Nature is capable, if he ſhould preſcribe only one to a Patient, who was not before in Poſſeſſion of the other?

Though, my Lord, I have eſtabliſhed the Truth of my Hypotheſis beyond Confutation, only from the Conſideration of your *firſt* Syllogiſm, I will proceed to demonſtrate it as clearly from your Lordſhip's *ſecond*. That the Bigots being deprived of every the leaſt Pretence to Argument, it may be apparent to every Eye, that their Rejection of my Hypotheſis can

proceed

proceed only from Obſtinacy. Your Lordſhip ſays,

The antient Lawgivers univerſally believed, that ſuch a Religion can be ſupported only by an Extraordinary Providence.
Moſes, who inſtituted ſuch a Religion, was an antient Lawgiver:
Therefore *Moſes* believed his Religion was ſupported by an Extraordinary Providence.

How frequently muſt ſo excellent a Logician as your Lordſhip have laughed to ſee, that though *all* your Enemies denied the *Major* of this Syllogiſm, yet that *none* of them have ever, in ſo many Years, diſputed the Legality of its Conſtruction. But, on the contrary, they have all aſſented to the Legality of its Form, as if it were built upon the ſame ſelf-evident Principles as the common one,

Every Man is an Animal;
Peter is a Man,
Therefore *Peter* is an Animal.

Your Lordſhip had ſeen, that on Account of the many idle Subtilties of the Schoolmen, latter Ages had too much neglected even the moſt uſeful Parts of the excellent Science of Logick. With your uſual Art and Addreſs, my Lord, you took Advantage

of this Neglect, and tried, whether the World would diſtinguiſh a *Similarity* from an *Identity* of Form. For the categorical Form is perfect, when there is a neceſſary Connexion between the *Subject* and the *Predicate* of the *Major* Propoſition, *i. e.* when the Predicate is implied in the *Definition* of the *Subject*, as in the latter Syllogiſm, " Every Man is an Animal." But your Lordſhip thought, and Experience has ſhewn you were not miſtaken, that a Syllogiſm of ſimilar Conſtruction, without this neceſſary Connexion, would paſs off undetected by many. The Attempt was, indeed, exquiſitely ingenious, but it was the Greatneſs of its Ingenuity which prevented its Diſcovery, to the Honour of your Lordſhip's Abilities. Your Adverſaries did not perceive, that, though in perfect Form, the *Minor* neceſſarily preſuppoſes the Truth of the *Major*; in your Lordſhip's, the *Major* cannot be admitted, unleſs the Truth of the *Minor* be firſt eſtabliſhed.

Leſt, however, any, from Envy of your Lordſhip's ſtupendous Genius, ſhould inſiſt, that your *Syllogiſm* is ſtrictly logical, when it diſplays the fineſt Inſtance of your Skill in Sophiſtry; I ſhall beg Leave to borrow a Propoſition for my Major from another Part of your Work, and produce a Syllogiſm exactly of the *ſame* Form with your Lordſhip's,

ſhip's, to prove the Truth of a Propoſition directly repugnant to that for which you brought yours. The Syllogiſm is this:

"None of the antient Philoſophers be-
"lieved the Doctrine of a Future State of
"Rewards and Puniſhments, though they
"ſedulouſly taught it the People."

But *Moſes* was an antient Philoſopher:

Therefore *Moſes* did not believe the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Puniſhments, though he ſedulouſly taught it the People.

Thus you ſee, my Lord, I have directly proved, that *Moſes did* inculcate the Belief of a Future State of Rewards and Puniſhments, by an Argument exactly of the ſame Kind as your Lordſhip's. Not, my Lord, that I have the Vanity to pretend, I have here diſcovered an Argument which had eſcaped you. For I do not doubt, but your Lordſhip was aware of it yourſelf, only it did not ſuit your Purpoſe to form it into a Syllogiſm. Should any one pretend that there is this Difference between the two Syllogiſms; that *Moſes* was really an "An-
"tient Lawgiver, but not a Philoſopher;" how would your Lordſhip laugh to think, that any one ſhould have Faith in the *Divine Legation* of *Moſes*, and yet deny him

to

to have been a *Philosopher*, or a *Lover of Truth*.

Having thus proved, by several Demonstrations, each of which is not only "as "*strong*, but as *short* too, as any of *Eu-* "*clid's* *;" that the *Bishop of* Gloucester's *Propositions and Demonstrations are not supported by Reason*, the Conclusion follows of course, *that his Lordship's Propositions, &c. are supported* by *Ridicule* of *Modern Reasoning*.

It will, however, perhaps, be objected, for Modern Reasoners frequently urge Objections from *Conjecture* against *Demonstration*, that, had it been your Lordship's Intention to have ridiculed Modern Reasoning from your Regard to Religion, you would not have made Choice of the Divine Legation of *Moses* for your Subject. But, my Lord, how weak is such an Objection! For what Injury could Religion receive from your Choice of a Subject; the Truth of which is so evident from Arguments within the Reach of the meanest Capacity. And how could your Lordship have made the Experiment so well on any other Subject, as a religious one, which engrosses the Attention, not only of every Sect of *Christians*, but likewise of every Kind of Unbelievers. But so far is the Choice of

* Taken from the *Divine Legation*.

the

the Subject from impugning, that it alone would be ſufficient to eſtabliſh my Hypotheſis. For can any one in his Senſes believe, that your Lordſhip would ſeriouſly ſpend the greater Part of your important Life in writing *five large Octavo* Volumes, to prove the Divine Legation of *Moſes*, when you know, my Lord, that a full Demonſtration of this Point may be contained in five *ſmall Pages* of the *ſmalleſt Duodecimo?*

Had I, my Lord, only Reaſon, and not *Prejudice* likewiſe to encounter, I ſhould not have the leaſt Doubt, but that ſuch an Accumulation of Proofs of the Truth of my Hypotheſis would produce Conviction in every Mind. But that ſome Bigots will refuſe their Aſſent to them, is not only what I expect, but it is likewiſe no more than what I deſire. For the Oppoſition of Bigotry is a certain Criterion of Truth. The Party, however, my Lord, from which I expect the greateſt Obſtruction, ſtrange as it may at firſt Sight appear to ſome, is from your Lordſhip yourſelf. For, in your Dedication to the late Lord *Hardwicke*, you ſay; "As an Author I am not ſollicitous "for the Reputation of any literary Per-"formance. A Work given to the World "every Reader has a Right to cenſure. "If it has Merit it will go down to Po-"ſterity:

"ſterity: If it has none, the ſooner it "dies and is forgot the better." From this total Indifference to Fame, I am afraid your Lordſhip will refuſe to confeſs, that my Hypotheſis is true. A Confirmation of its Truth devoutly to be wiſhed. And, my Lord, I ſuſpect, from your uncommon Modeſty, that your Lordſhip will not be content merely to withold your Confirmation from an Hypotheſis, which, if *Exoteric*, would redound ſo much to your Lordſhip's Honour, (but that to endeavour to continue it *Eſoteric* *,) your Lordſhip will even condeſcend to oppoſe it with the ſame Vein of Irony which runs ſo beautifully through your whole *Divine Legation*. If this ſhould be the Caſe, as indeed it muſt be, for your Lordſhip to be conſiſtent with yourſelf, I ſhall think it a Duty, which I owe to Truth and your Reputation, to enter the Liſts, with your Lordſhip, in Defence of my Hypotheſis. And armed with Truth and Reaſon, I ſhall have no Dread of a "diſhonourable Grave," but undauntedly approach even an Hoſt of Adverſaries, though led to Battle by a *Goliah*. For, my Lord, ſo earneſtly do I deſire, and ſo zealous am I in the Endeavour to diffuſe your Lordſhip's Fame, that, not content with

* See this Diſtinction relative to the Tenets of the Antient Philoſophers in *The Divine Legation*.

my

my preſent Proofs of my Hypotheſis, from an Examination of your *fundamental* Propoſitions; I ſhall, in ſome future Works, clearly deduce the ſame from your *incidental* ones. And notwithſtanding the Pain it may give your Modeſty, as it is a Modeſty, my Lord, which is injurious to the Intereſts of Truth, and your Lordſhip's Glory, I ſhall take all the Care in my Power, that every one of theſe Proofs be tranſmitted down to the lateſt Poſterity; and that they be enrolled amongſt the Volumes of everlaſting Fame.

It would be utterly unpardonable, my Lord, in any one who had the leaſt Regard to the Welfare of his Country and the Intereſts of Religion, to conclude an Addreſs of this Kind, without expreſſing his Wiſhes that your Lordſhip may riſe from your preſent Situation, to the higheſt Dignity the Church has to beſtow. Who that knows how intimately your Lordſhip is verſed in all the Legiſlations of the Antients, all the Politics of the Moderns, and in all the *Utopian* Schemes of Government both antient and modern, can forbear to lament, that you, my Lord, have a Place only in the great Aſſembly of the Nation; when, if admitted likewiſe to the Cabinet, the moſt ſalutary Effects might be expected from your Lordſhip's Guidance. For who

 can

can ſufficiently admire the noble Concern for, and thorough Knowledge of, the eſtabliſhed Religion and political Intereſts of this Kingdom, which your Lordſhip ſo eminently diſplayed in your Objections to the Naturalization of the *Jews*. How juſtly did your Lordſhip imagine, that if that Bill had not been repealed, the *Introduction* of ſo many *Foreigners* would have ſtarved our own *Countrymen*, that *Jewiſh Infidelity* would have deſtroyed the *Chriſtian Faith*, that *human Laws* would have aboliſhed a *divine Legiſlation*, and that the *Skill* of *Man* would have fruſtrated the *Predictions* of *God* *. But, my Lord, great and conſpicuous as are your Merits, much I fear that they will never be properly rewarded. And even from your Lordſhip's own Writings my gloomy Preſages ariſe. For it is evident, that it is your Lordſhip's own Opinion, I do not mean altogether from your famous Sermon, but likewiſe from your other Works, that Rewards of Merit are not to be expected. What, but to ſatirize the Neglect of moſt Governors, eſpecially of our own, in this Reſpect, could be your Lordſhip's Deſign, in your exquiſitely facetious Proof, that the Diſtribution of Rewards can make no Part of Civil Government? Ironically maintaining it by theſe

* See Dedication to *Jews*, D. L. Vol. III.

Argu-

Arguments: *First*, "*That Society could not* "*distinguish the Objects of its Favour*, be-"cause, *their Motives cannot be known* *." Whereas your Lordship knew that the same Argument would equally have availed to the Exclusion likewise of Punishment. For as in the latter Case it is sufficient, a Man does by Design, not by Accident, an Injury; so, in the former, it is enough that he does by Design, not by Accident, a Benefit to Society. *Secondly*, "That *Society could not* reward, "*though it should* discover *the Objects of* "*its Favour*, because (as all Rewards must be pecuniary) "*no Society can ever find a Sum* "*sufficient without raising it on the People as* "*a Tax, to pay it back to them as a Reward.*" How humorous is your Lordship's Reasoning! how keen your Satire! But though the former makes me laugh, yet, the Moment I reflect on the Justness of the latter, and that the Object of it may affect your Lordship, my Mirth vanishes, and Grief takes Possession of my Breast. For from the following Paragraph it is evident, that it is your Lordship's Opinion not only that Merit is not rewarded, but likewise that the Want of it is the only Way to Preferment and Honours. "In the Course of "forty or fifty Years a new Generation or "two are sprung up; and those whom their

* See D. L. Vol. I. Section 2.

 "Pro-

" Profeſſion has dedicated to this Service,
" *(Religion,) Experience* has taught, that
" the Talents required for puſhing their
" Fortune, lies very remote from what en-
" ables Men to figure in a ſucceſsful De-
" fence of Revelation. And it is very na-
" tural to think, that in general they will
" be chiefly bent to cultivate thoſe Quali-
" ties on which they ſee their Patrons lay
" the greateſt Streſs." Since ſuch are your Lordſhip's Sentiments, I have but one Conſolation; which ariſes from the old Adage, " That there is no general Rule without " an Exception." That a *Secker*, a *Drummond*, a *Terrick*, a *Trevor*, a *Hume*, a *Lowth*, a *Cornwallis*, a *Newton*, a *Young*, a *Green*, a *Moſs*, &c. &c. &c. ſhould ſit on the Bench of Biſhops, might indeed be thought no great Wonder, though your Obſervation held *univerſally* true. But if this were the Caſe, that your Lordſhip ſhould have a Place among them would be impoſſible. If, therefore, your Lordſhip be an Exception to the general Rule, by your Promotion to your preſent Station, why may you not likewiſe be the ſame by your Advancement to the higheſt Dignity the Church has to beſtow? Long, therefore, very long may it be, before your Lordſhip be tranſlated from Earth to Heaven, to exchange a terreſtrial Mitre for a celeſtial Crown, and the higheſt reaſon-

ing

Powers of Man for the Intuition of an
gel.

I am, my LORD,

With the profoundeſt Reſpect,

Your LORDSHIP'S

moſt devoted,

and moſt humble Servant,

A. C. R.

F I N I S.